

Strachan, secretary-treasurer, setting forth that the culture of our native land should march hand in hand with our economic program, and that the enlightening influence of the arts on our national character is a vital part of our democratic heritage and that encouragement of the arts has been sadly lacking in the United States heretofore, and therefore heartily endorsing the pending Coffee bill (H. R. 9102) for the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts; to the Committee on Education.

4858. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the Massachusetts State branch, American Federation of Teachers, recording uncompromising opposition to the so-called industrial mobilization bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4859. Also, resolution of the Massachusetts State branch, American Federation of Teachers, recording its hearty support of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4860. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the American Legion, New York County organization, urging the retention of all post exchanges without restriction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4861. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, protesting against the passage of the May bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4862. Also, petition of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, expressing its approval of the provisions of Senate bill 3390; to the Committee on Labor.

4863. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States concerning Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, relative to providing all necessary aids to night air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4864. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6, relative to Federal tax on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4865. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4866. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5, relative to making Federal funds available for flood relief; to the Committee on Flood Control.

4867. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, imploring the President of the United States and the Maritime Commission to withdraw their opposition to the McAdoo-Welch resolution and make every effort to retain at least the Panama-Pacific liners in their present essential intercoastal service; to the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

4868. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning their Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, relative to reimbursement by the Federal Government to States and counties for expenditures in behalf of nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4869. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., concerning Senate bill 3390, to extend the powers of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4870. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., concerning House bill 3134, to impose a tax on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4871. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, Inc., Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., concerning the Barry bill (H. R. 2717); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4872. Also, petition of the Long Beach Municipal Band, Long Beach, Calif., concerning House bill 4947 and Senate bill 2369; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4873. Also, petition of Peter J. Salmon, secretary and assistant director, the Industrial Home for the Blind, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2819 and companion bill introduced by Mrs. O'DAY, for the creation of a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4874. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting against the inclusion of furniture and toys in any reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4875. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Navy Yard Local Union, No. 543, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Federal Workers Minimum Wage Act of 1938 (H. R. 9158); to the Committee on Labor.

4876. Also, petition of the Industrial Home for the Blind, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging consideration of Senate bill 2819; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4877. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of the Vermont Society of Engineers, protesting against the curtailment of the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Roads.

4878. By Mr. QUINN: Resolutions of Local 610, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Wilmerding, Pa., protesting against the May bill (H. R. 9604); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4879. Also, resolutions of the Duplate Local, Federation of Flat Glass Workers, Creighton, Pa., on State and Federal work relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4880. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against the passage of the so-called anti-firearms bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4881. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by 270 residents of Sussex County, N. J., protesting against the National Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4882. By the SPEAKER: Petition of veterans' nonpartisan clubs of the Twelfth District, Pomona, Calif., urging a congressional investigation of the trial and conviction of Congressman John H. Hoeppel; to the Committee on Rules.

4883. Also, petition of the Valley Cottage Regular Democratic Club of Rockland County, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution dated April 12, 1938, with reference to Roosevelt haters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4884. Also, petition of the South Carolina Federation of Commerce, Agriculture, and Industry, Columbia, S. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national economic problems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1938

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

Let us pray.

O Eternal God and Heavenly Father, whose mercies cannot be numbered, in whose presence there is the fullness of joy, and at whose right hand there is pleasure for evermore: draw us closer unto Thee and to each other as we pause to pay reverent tribute to the memory of our brother beloved whom we have loved long since and lost a while, whose conspicuous devotion to his country crowned his gifts of leadership, and whose loyalty to friends was as the armor of a knight dedicated to a divine adventure.

Help us, therefore, we beseech Thee, to learn to understand wisdom secretly, for Thou requirest truth in the inward parts, and grant us the spirit of humility, without which faith becomes presumption, hope delusion, and love weakness, that

we may find it the source of deathless courage as it calls the soul to the Christ, where it may learn its deepest wisdom from the open book of His meek and lowly heart. We ask it in His name and for His sake. Amen.

For all emotions that are tense and strong,
And utmost knowledge, I have lived for these—
Lived deep, and let the lesser things live long,
The everlasting hills, the lakes, the trees,
Who'd give their thousand years to sing this song
Of life, and man's high sensibilities,
Which I into the face of death can sing—
O death, thou poor and disappointed thing—
Strike if thou wilt, and soon; strike breast and brow;
For I have lived: and thou canst rob me now
Only of some long life that ne'er has been.
The life that I have lived, so full, so keen,
Is mine! I hold it firm beneath thy blow
And, dying, take it with me where I go.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 19, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 2206) to provide for the transfer of enlisted men of the Coast Guard to the Coast Guard Reserve.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1279. An act to authorize the sale, under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 203), of surplus War Department real property;

S. 2531. An act to authorize the transfer of certain military reservations to other agencies of the Government and to the people of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes;

S. 3160. An act to provide for the exchange of land in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 3272. An act to clarify the status of pay and allowances under the provisions of the act of September 3, 1919; and

S. 3530. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, by reestablishing the Regular Army Reserve, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the exercises set for today make it appropriate that a quorum should be present. I suggest the absence of one and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Caraway	Hatch	McKellar
Andrews	Chavez	Hayden	McNary
Austin	Connally	Herring	Maloney
Bailey	Copeland	Hill	Miller
Bankhead	Davis	Hitchcock	Milton
Barkley	Dieterich	Holt	Minton
Berry	Donahey	Hughes	Murray
Bilbo	Duffy	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Bone	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Borah	Frazier	King	Nye
Bridges	George	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Brown, Mich.	Gerry	Lee	Overton
Brown, N. H.	Gibson	Lewis	Pittman
Bulkeley	Gillette	Lodge	Pope
Bulow	Glass	Logan	Radcliffe
Burke	Green	Loneragan	Reames
Byrd	Guffey	Lundeen	Reynolds
Byrnes	Hale	McCarran	Russell
Capper	Harrison	McGill	Schwartz

Schwellenbach	Smith	Tydings	Walsh
Sheppard	Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	Wheeler
Shipstead	Townsend	Van Nuys	White
Smathers	Truman	Wagner	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained from the Senate on important public business. I ask that this announcement may be recorded for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL (S. DOC. NO. 169)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the office of the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1937, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the purchase abroad by the Federal Government of canned meats for the personnel of the Civilian Conservation Corps and other agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Townsend Club, No. 12, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 4199, the so-called General Welfare Act, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Trades Assembly of the American Federation of Labor, of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for Government ownership of railroads and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce the present tax on capital gains and losses, which was ordered to lie on the table.

TAXATION OF RELIGIOUS AND PHILANTHROPIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance an editorial from the Bee Hive for April 1938, by Mr. E. W. Thompson, on impractical taxation. This is an excellent statement of the necessity for protection of religious and philanthropic institutions from the destructive power of taxation.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRACTICAL TAXATION

If the taxpayers of America were called upon to care for the orphans, the widows, the destitute, and the aged that the fraternal organizations of the United States of America care for, it would be a different story from what it is today, when tens of thousands, representing millions of dollars of fraternal and benevolent expenditures, are cared for through the channels of fraternity. If these wards of charity now cared for by the fraternal institutions of the country were to be made public wards, and the taxpayers were to be called upon to bear this added burden, it would be, in our opinion, next to impossible for them to meet the conditions and successfully carry the load.

It is upon these grounds that the fraternal institutions of this country and Canada have always been given exemption of taxation by the Federal Governments and by the States and Provinces. To tax the funds of the fraternal beneficiary associations would be a matter of double taxation and will ultimately lead up to vast burdens in financial demands for the care of the destitute being heaped upon the already overburdened taxpayer.

We have always believed that in the world of Christian civilization there were four things that should not be subject to taxation: First, the church, the conservator of public morals; second, the educational institutions of the country, which afford enlightenment and culture to the people, rich and poor alike; third, the fraternal beneficiary associations, which protect the individual and the homes of the country in a common security and a common service; and, fourth, the cemeteries, where all find a

last place of rest in the great common democracy and fraternity of death.

These are all vital essentials of Christian civilization. The elimination of these essential elements in the operation of civilized society would cause it to cease to be Christian or civilized. These elements constitute not only the essential social and fraternal elements of life but the sacred things of life; and advanced modern Christian civilization cannot afford the loss of any of these common elements of service. With all these things so essential to the welfare of society, it causes one to marvel that anyone would favor placing any obstacles in the way of the preservation of these higher essentials of life which assures us a common purpose and a common service that means a common and universal security. It is these things alone that enable us to live in security and at last to die in peace.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELIEF

Mr. BYRNES, from the Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief, which was directed by Senate Resolution 36 to make an investigation of unemployment and relief, submitted a preliminary report (No. 1625), which was ordered to be printed.

ST. CLAIR RIVER BRIDGE, PORT HURON, MICH.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment House bill 9257, to extend the time for building a bridge across the St. Clair River at Port Huron, Mich., and I submit a report (No. 1624) thereon. The bridge is practically completed, but the time of the authorization has almost expired. There is a complete agreement regarding the bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9257) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich., authorized to be built by the State of Michigan, by and through its State bridge commission, or the successors of said commission, by an act of Congress approved August 30, 1935, is hereby extended 2 years from August 30, 1938.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3865) for the relief of the Lamson Co., Inc.; and A bill (S. 3866) for the relief of John R. Holt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 3867) authorizing the North Dakota State Highway Department and the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Red River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3868) to provide for the acquisition of certain property for park and recreational purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3869) for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and

as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 3870) to add certain lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 3871) to create a commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 3872) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising out of the Tariff Act of 1922; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A bill (S. 3873) to authorize the construction and operation of an auditorium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 3874) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, the Federal Reserve Act, and the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 3875) to amend section 313 of the Communications Act of 1934; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 3876) relating to the transportation by railroad of persons and property for or on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 284) to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third Pan American Highway Conference; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 285) to authorize and request the President of the United States to invite the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics to hold its seventh general assembly in the United States during the calendar year 1939, and to invite foreign governments to participate in that general assembly; and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses necessary for participation by the United States in the meeting; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELIEF APPROPRIATION FOR 1938—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill —, the 1938 relief appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following new section:

"Sec. —. No person whose compensation, or any part thereof, is paid from funds appropriated by this act shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. Any such person shall retain the right to vote as he pleases and to privately express his opinions on all political subjects, but shall take no active part in political management or in political campaigns. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used to pay the compensation of such person."

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10238) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1939, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 11, line 14, to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,400,000";

On page 11, line 16, to strike out "\$6,232,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,832,500"; and

On page 14, line 11, to strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,600,000."

COMPENSATION IN IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE—AMENDMENT

Mr. COPELAND submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1543) to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, relating to the compensation of certain Immigration and Naturalization Service employees, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEALINGS OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA AND P. W. A.

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 269), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Administrator of the Public Works Administration, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, is hereby requested to send to the Senate copies of any letters which have been written to him by any official of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania authorizing any particular party or parties to represent him or the Commonwealth or the State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in its dealings with the Public Works Administration.

CLAIM OF IDA F. BRAUN ET AL.

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 270), which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3869) entitled "A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

KOSHER POULTRY AND THE CONSUMER—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM F. MORGAN, JR.

[Mr. COPELAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Kosher Poultry and the Consumer, delivered by William Fellows Morgan, Jr., commissioner of markets of New York City, on April 11, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill and ask for its immediate consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9621) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 15, 16, 17, 21, 26, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 62, 77, 84, 85, 86, 92, 93, 99, 100, and 105.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 66, 67, 73, 74, 76, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95, 97, 101, 103, 104, and 106, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$253,470"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$82,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter

inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$660,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$104,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and \$10,000 shall be available for the repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$378,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Shawnee Sanatorium, Oklahoma: General repairs and improvements, \$35,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,870,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$685,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$250,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$365,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$324,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,264,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "for the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of certain lands, within Mount Rainier National Park, \$30,000; in all, \$176,555"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"All appropriations for vocational education under the Office of Education in this act shall be used exclusively for vocational education purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 20, 22, 28, 34, 46, 53, 54, 60, 61, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 98.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
ALBERT E. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what action was taken with regard to the amendment dealing with butter substitutes which was attached by the Senate to the Interior Department appropriation bill? It will be recalled that the Senate receded from a similar amendment which had been added to the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate conferees receded from that amendment in conformance with the action taken by the Senate on the similar amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

NAVAL EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, being the naval expansion bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9218) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in addressing myself to the pending bill which proposes such a tremendous expansion of our Navy, I should like, first of all, to have it clearly understood for the sake of the record, that my attitude toward the issue of national defense is not different from that which is entertained by those who are holding a brief for this bill. I want my country adequately prepared at any hour successfully to defend itself against any attack, singly or jointly, by a foreign foe or foes. I want my country prepared to repel any attack that might place any American property directly in jeopardy. I think we have such a degree of preparedness today. So far as our Naval Establishment is concerned, I think we have the adequacy of defense necessary to repulse any foe or group of foes that might choose to attack us. So far as ability abroad to attack us is concerned, and so far as present preparation upon our part is concerned, we have every bit of what is called an adequate national defense.

What is proposed in addition to what we have is most emphatically a preparation, not to defend ourselves, but to carry on aggressive warfare thousands of miles away from the shores and the homes for which national defense should be provided.

The current number of the Foreign Affairs Magazine carries a very interesting article by Hanson W. Baldwin, an authority on the question of the degree of adequacy of our defense. At page 444 of that magazine I find him expressing himself in this manner:

The Army and Navy are at present prepared to defend both coasts of the United States against simultaneous invasion, and at the same time to protect Hawaii, Panama, Alaska, and probably South America from any attacks that can reasonably be foreseen; but they cannot, either with our existing defense establishment or with any now contemplated, defend the Philippines or Guam; they cannot keep the "open door" in China from being slammed in our faces, and they cannot protect our commerce and citizens everywhere. The question before the American people therefore is, Shall the Army and Navy be strengthened sufficiently to enable them to do any one or all of these things?

Mr. President, I insist that that is the challenge which we face today. If we are to undertake to defend American commerce and citizens anywhere upon the face of the earth, I say to the Senate that the United States will break its back in preparation for that sort of emergency before it ever has a chance to resort to its preparations for the emergency. We cannot reasonably afford in time and money to provide the adequacy of defense which would be necessary to meet all the challenges with which some may surmise we shall have to contend.

I repeat that we have an adequate national defense. In all probability there is not a foe, there is not a group of foes that might be conceived today who could, first of all, afford to leave their own front yards and back yards long enough even to threaten an encroachment upon American territory. The problems at home of the nations that are looked to as being potential enemies today are problems which

will occupy their time, their attention, and their energy for years and years and years to come. Anyone who is lying awake nights fearing what particular potential foes might do to us, or to our neighbors to the south or to the north, it seems to me is wasting a great deal of energy which might be directed into far more profitable channels.

We could, however, without a penny of expense to ourselves, enlarge greatly upon our national defense; and I should like to have a course pursued which would eliminate some of these things which constantly threaten and agitate us and cause a feeling that we are not adequately prepared for any emergency which might arise in the way of an attack upon our country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves his general observation in regard to adequacy of existing defense, I should like to remind him of a statement made by the Secretary of War on March 15 at Miami, Fla., which may have escaped his attention. Certainly it has not had the emphasis it deserves. This is a statement from official sources.

The Secretary of War, speaking at Miami on March 15, as reported by the Associated Press, said:

The United States is better prepared today than at any time in its history for whatever happens.

Mr. NYE. May I ask the Senator again the date of that address?

Mr. VANDENBERG. March 15.

Mr. NYE. Of this year?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. NYE. So it is, Mr. President, that, privately and sometimes when they are off guard, responsible authorities will and do acknowledge an adequacy of preparation on the part of our country, what we commonly refer to as an adequate national defense, to meet emergencies which might arise. Certainly there is no occasion for the alarm which many are sounding today about our country and our citizens and our homes being in jeopardy, and about the grave danger of some foreign foe showing up over the horizon some morning with a force sufficient to make any impression at all upon the country. There is no occasion for it; and yet we have to acknowledge that those influences have been at work instilling within the minds and hearts of the patriotic, honest people of this country the idea that our defense is not what it ought to be to guard against some of the emergencies which may arise. If we continue to entertain and nurse such fear, we shall be moving in a direction which ultimately will find us opening the Treasury of the United States to the extent, not of a billion dollars, not of a billion and a half dollars a year, but of two, three, four, or five billion dollars a year.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that our outlay this year for national defense—our outlay this year in the name of preparedness for war—is very nearly four times greater than it was the year before we entered the war which was going to end war and do away with all of this waste of expensive preparation. We know, too, that, however successful may be our opposition to the pending bill, there is going to be a great enlargement next year over present budgets in the name of preparedness for war. There is not any end to this program. If we let ourselves go, we shall find one day that the sky is the limit as it relates to budgets in the name of national defense.

Before being interrupted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], I was about to speak of certain steps which might be taken by the Congress which would very greatly enlarge our national defense without entailing a penny of cost to the United States Government.

There are pending in one committee and another of the Congress certain legislative proposals which, were they to be enacted into law in toto, would, I believe, eliminate 90 percent of the danger of our country ever having to participate in another war; measures which would in very large degree make impossible the attitude of a great many persons who contend that war is sometimes a preferable thing,

certainly not a thing to be feared from their standpoint. We have in the United States today an element which labors under the impression that a war would be a good thing for the United States; that we could anticipate from war a recovery from the present depression; that if we were to engage in war, there would at once be a quick swing that would afford employment to all the unemployed; that there would be available for products of all kinds prices which would represent something more than the cost of production; that if we were to go to war we could bring to ourselves a great degree of prosperity; and I think there is reason to believe that such hope and feeling might be fulfilled. All we need do is to recall the experience of something more than 20 years ago, when we gave the American people a large education in the thought that there is profit to be had in war.

Unfortunately, the memories of some persons are too short to enable them to recall that while we enjoyed a momentary prosperity as a result of the World War, we afterward paid the penalty for it; today we are still paying the penalty for it; and generations unborn at this hour will have their turn some day in carrying a part of the burden of cost, debt, and waste that resulted from our participation in a fruitless venture starting back in 1917.

It ought to be the desire of everyone who really is opposed to war to destroy the influence which make so readily for war. It ought to be the hope of every one of us and the effort of every one of us to give so emphatic a notice in the way of legislation that no American citizen may have cause to believe that it would be possible for any American to make one penny of profit out of it if and when our country should engage in another war. That profit possibility can be removed, very definitely removed, if we but have the will to turn ourselves to the task of writing a revenue bill to become effective automatically with a declaration of war on the part of our country, a revenue bill fixing rates of taxation on incomes of individuals and corporations, not fixing them so high that it will alter their standard of living, but so high that war is not going to be possible of meaning a penny of profit to anyone in this land. I think that if we were to enact that kind of legislation we would quickly put an end to the sentiment which is so often expressed, that what we need in order to get out of the depression we are in, and have been in, is another little war. Those who speak so idly, those who are so shortsighted as to speak in that manner, would, if notice were given that no one would be able to make profit out of another war, at once become parties to a cause that would maintain the policy, "Let America avoid entanglements abroad again by resort to whatever reasonable methods may be necessary." "Let us avoid war," as some would put it, "at any cost, if it is possible reasonably to avoid it."

There is pending in the Congress, and has been for nearly 4 years, a bill which would insure that kind of revenue rates, a bill which would most emphatically destroy that method of profit which is playing so large a part in the consideration of many people today. That bill as introduced in the present Congress is identified as Senate bill 1331.

During the last 3 or 4 years there has been widespread agitation, there has been agreement on every hand, that we ought to take the profit out of war. At one time it appeared as though Congress was able to do the job. There were those who were entertaining grave fears privately about the job being done, men and influences who did not want the job done, and, as a consequence, an effort was made to camouflage the issue, to befuddle the American mind, to bring forth things called war-profit bills, which did not begin to take the profit out of war.

First of all was the inception, the introduction, of the so-called Hill-Sheppard bill, which pretended to take the profit out of war and accomplish universal conscription. The accomplishment of universal conscription, to my way of thinking, is not attainable except and until the people are ready by constitutional amendment to make certain that the Government is going to have the same right over property and capital in the event of war that it exercises over

lives during war. There is now in time of war very definitely a double standard, a standard which treats a human life as if it were only so much ashes, but proceeds with greatest caution and with due process before it takes property that is needed in winning the war.

The Hill-Sheppard proposal, so far as it would attempt to take the profit out of war, would fail of that object. Had the Hill-Sheppard bill been the law of the land in 1917 and 1918, when the United States was engaged in the World War, thousands of Americans would not have paid as much in the way of taxes to the Federal Government as they paid under the lesser rates of taxation which prevailed at that time.

Take the profit out of war. The bill referred to does not begin to tackle that job, it does not begin to do that job. Yet there are thousands of people in the country laboring under the impression that the Hill-Sheppard bill is designed to take the profit out of war.

More recently there has been injected into the picture, because the Hill-Sheppard program was so thoroughly discredited, what is known as the May bill. It is not sufficiently different from the bill to which I have just referred to deserve any different description than I have given of the Hill-Sheppard bill. If we would secure for ourselves a really adequate national defense, I repeat, one of our first steps should be to insure against the possibility of any American, anyone, profiting from another war in which our country might engage.

National defense—and we are told this by reason of the bill that is pending before us at the present time—an adequate national defense demands that by all means we remove the motive of profit which leads so many influential men and interests constantly to agitate the public into a belief that we are inadequately prepared for emergencies. There are persons who know that there is much profit to be made out of armament races, there is money to be made out of national defense, and when a national-defense program can be whipped into the proportions of an armament race, the greater is the chance for profit.

Time and again, when the emergency seemed great, and when Congress was meeting the emergency by appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, we have seen men and institutions who were dependent on producing the things demanded for a defense program kite prices until the cost of building a given thing was all out of proportion to the cost which prevailed before the emergency was alleged to exist.

Since the introduction of the pending naval bill we have found prices mounting day after day, until today the estimate is that it will cost a billion and a quarter dollars, whereas originally it was estimated that the cost of the program before us would be approximately \$800,000,000.

Mr. President, there is only one way of destroying the influence which in the interest of profit is constantly at work building up fear concerning the adequacy of our national defense. There is only one way to do it, and that is by a program of legislative regulation of private industries which engage in the manufacture of the instruments of warfare.

We know, too, that no program of regulation is going to affect some of the racketeering corporations which have demonstrated again and again and again their bad faith when it comes to fulfilling the orders of the Government in the name of national defense, and because that is true there is most emphatic need for a legislative program which will find the United States entering more largely than it already has entered into the field of providing its own national-defense requirements. That program of regulation and that program of nationalization in a limited degree is involved in Senate bill 2603, which was sponsored by a majority of the members of the Senate Munitions Committee 2 years ago.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Speaking of adequate national defense, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Suppose we draw a line from Bering Sea to the Hawaiian Islands, to

the Panama Canal, to the Virgin Islands, to northeast Maine, and call that area our territorial waters, and confine our present fleet to those American territorial waters; in the opinion of the Senator, would our Navy as now constituted be adequate?

Mr. NYE. I may say to the Senator that I read from an authority, probably before he came into the Chamber, in the person of Hanson W. Baldwin, who maintains that our defense at the present time is adequate to protect us. I read his exact language:

The Army and Navy are at present prepared to defend both coasts of the United States against simultaneous invasion, and at the same time to protect Hawaii, Panama, Alaska, and probably South America from any attack that can reasonably be foreseen.

It seems to me that is a complete answer to the Senator's question. He indicates that we would be able, within the line drawn, adequately to provide for and take care of our defense in the territory indicated.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to have the Senator clarify that point, for much is being said, and has been said, that seems to indicate that our Navy is not first-class, that our Navy is inadequate and unequal to any such occasion as might arise on either coast. It is my belief that unless we send our fleets into remote waters, in Europe, Asia, or Africa, our Navy is adequate. But I am willing to grant that if we are to send our Navy to belt the globe and police the world, then the provision and authorization now under consideration is not sufficient.

Mr. NYE. No, Mr. President; and no provision that could be measured within a reasonable number of billions of dollars will be adequate, if we shall make it our policy to send, whenever occasion may arise, great strength in naval craft, in marines, and in army preparation up all the rivers of the world, including the Yangtze, to which the Senator made reference yesterday. We cannot hope to provide that degree of adequacy of national defense.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. POPE. Who is Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, whom the Senator cites as his authority?

Mr. NYE. Mr. Baldwin writes in Foreign Affairs magazine. He has written various articles in that magazine as an authority upon the issue of national defense.

Mr. POPE. Does he give reasons for his statement, or is that simply his opinion?

Mr. NYE. I must confess to having had this particular paragraph in his article called to my attention. I have not had a chance to read his entire article. The Senator's interest, however, will probably prompt him to read the article, and I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it now, but will be glad to let the Senator have it to read if he wishes.

Mr. President, I was speaking of what might be done to afford a more adequate national defense without great outlay to the people of the United States. I spoke first of the necessity of taking the element of profit out of war; then of taking the motive of profit out of the game of preparing for war. If we want a further adequacy in our national defense, the Congress would be wise to take up where the House left off and give consideration to that clause which would let a certain question in the future be determined by all the people, rather than by only a few of us who might be under the utmost pressure at the moment. I have reference to what has commonly been referred to as the Ludlow proposed amendment to the Constitution, an amendment which would give to the people a voice in determining when again our country should engage in another foreign war.

In the Senate several proposals were offered by various Senators, and in February those who were interested joined hands in sponsoring a joint resolution which is now identified as Senate Joint Resolution 270. The joint resolution is simply a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United

States so as to provide for a referendum on war. It was offered by Senators LA FOLLETTE, BONE, CAPPER, CLARK, DONAHAY, FRAZIER, HITCHCOCK, LUNDEEN, MURRAY, NYE, SHIPSTEAD, and WHEELER. I have since learned that others have expressed the wish that they may be included as sponsors of that particular joint resolution.

There is not any good reason, Mr. President, why the people, the duly qualified electors of this land, should not be given a direct voice in determining when again they and their sons shall be dispatched into service in another foreign war. Sponsors of efforts of this kind are not those who are afraid of war. They are men and women who under certain conditions would not only rally, but would cause others to rally to the defense of their country if it were under attack; but they are men and women who deeply resent the idea that in this advanced day and age it is possible for a mere handful of men in these United States to move 130,000,000 people into a cause that may not be of their choosing, of their making in any degree, in any way, in any shape, or in any manner.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. As I remember, the resolution is very brief, and I hope the Senator will place the exact text in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. NYE. I shall be glad to do that. Perhaps that is a suggestion of merit. Senate Joint Resolution 270 reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except in case of attack by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened, upon the United States or its territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article, shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

"SEC. 3. This article shall become operative when ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution."

That, Mr. President, is the extent of the joint resolution which would accomplish the desirable purpose to which I have made reference.

Mr. NORRIS. From the reading of the joint resolution it seems that it provides that it shall be referred to the legislatures of the several States and also to conventions of the several States for ratification. I think the Senator will agree with me that both those proceedings are unnecessary. In fact, only one is necessary.

Mr. NYE. Only one is necessary, of course, and I think if the Senator will read the language he will find that it is in the alternative rather than containing a double requirement. That sort of constitutional provision, Mr. President, would aid materially our national defense and would aid us in avoiding wars of other countries.

A fourth step might be taken to enlarge upon and improve our national defense.

Mr. NORRIS. May I further interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NYE. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution provides as follows:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

That is a legal submission, of course; but, as the Senator knows, article V of the Constitution provides not only for that method of submitting a proposed amendment.

Mr. NYE. It also provides for the constitutional method as well; that is, ratification by conventions.

Mr. NORRIS. Section 3 of the joint resolution provides:

This article shall become operative when ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution.

Mr. NYE. That is an unnecessary repetition. The provision ought to be made at least in the alternative; and I may suggest that, since the joint resolution is pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from Nebraska is a member, I, for one, should be glad to delegate to him the watchfulness that would bring about the correction that is certainly called for.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator has answered the question I was about to ask him with respect to where the joint resolution is now. The Senator having made the statement that at this moment the joint resolution is before the Committee on the Judiciary, I have received the information I desired to obtain from the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand the present air force of the United States is about 2,000 airships. Does the Senator think that that is a sufficient air force for the United States of America?

Mr. NYE. No; I do not. I am glad to support such efforts as will undertake to provide a more adequate defense in the air, but I want that undertaken not by the Navy, where it is so costly a process; I want it undertaken as a unit of the Army, providing our own soil as the base for the ships that we will depend upon to take off and provide defense against attack if and when it ever comes. I may point out to the Senator, however, that while it is maintained today that we have only a limited number of airships—the Senator says 2,000—we have many more airships than that in the form of a reserve in one degree or another. No nation upon this earth has available so many commercial planes as we have in the event of emergency. I think we need not be immediately worried or concerned about any inadequacy in that particular field.

Before being interrupted, Mr. President, I was undertaking to make point of another step that might be taken. I have already made reference to it, namely, the need for a provision of law or of Constitution which will make sure that the Government, in time of war, will have the same power over a dollar, the same power over a piece of property, that it has exercised and will doubtless exercise again over the lives of its citizens in time of war.

There is no excuse for the continuation of the kind of standard we have pursued in time of war in the past. That challenge would be met by the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 124, which would remove any doubt as to the right of Congress or of the Government to exercise its powers over mere capital and property in time of war as it exercises power over human life.

Incidentally, I think we could very greatly improve upon the morale of our country and upon our degree of national defense if we would abandon the cause of compulsory military training, which a few States have already accomplished, which more States will accomplish, and which might be eliminated in its entirety by the enactment of Senate bill 367, which undertakes to afford Federal aid only to those schools which provide military training on a voluntary basis. The plan is not working injuriously in the States in which it is being tried. Military training is being continued. Certain students want it and have access to it on a voluntary basis. It seems to me the theory that no young man is deserving of a diploma from certain schools of learning until he has to his credit a certain amount of military training hardly becomes a nation and a race of people who pride themselves, as we do, on their advancement.

An immediate challenge to the United States, if it wants to provide an adequate national defense for itself, is that the Congress enact a law which will forbid, in peacetime and wartime alike, the sale or exportation of any instruments of war to any other nation upon the earth. That result would be accomplished under Senate Joint Resolution 120.

Various measures are pending which would effect embargoes against the exportation of this, that, and the other thing to nations engaged in war. For approximately 2 years a bill which would forbid the exportation of scrap iron to nations engaged in war has been pending before a committee of the Senate. Where is the bill? It is still in committee. Hearings have been conducted. More hearings are to be conducted. At every turn of the road, when there has been threat of interference with the scrap-iron business, a quiet something in the way of an influence has dictated, "We must not act too quickly upon a matter of this importance." The result is that for the past 3 or 4 years a greater quantity of scrap iron than ever before has been leaving our shores for shipment upon the high seas. Where has the scrap iron been going? Sixty-five percent of it has gone to Germany and Japan, the nations which those who fear the inadequacy of our national defense are most likely to regard as our most powerful potential foes in the future.

Mr. President, we in the United States are engaging in a program of arming all the world. Of course the more we arm the world the greater is the obligation upon us to provide larger funds necessary for the degree of national defense required to defend us some day against the weapons we have sold to others.

The chances are about 10 to 1, or perhaps 100 to 1, that the gasoline which powered the motors of the Japanese planes which descended upon and bombed the *Panay* in the Yangtze River sometime ago was gasoline delivered to Japan by American corporations, which had to have gunboats alongside their tankers to protect their opportunity to win a continuation of profits from the game of arming nations, that they may prolong their struggles against each other. Incidentally, these American corporations are wholly neutral, delivering oil to both China and Japan, under contract to keep the supply in Japan at a certain level at every hour of every day. The chances are 10 to 1, or perhaps 100 to 1, that the bombs which Japanese planes dropped upon the *Panay* were bombs manufactured in the United States. Greater than that chance is the chance that the shrapnel which found its way into the flesh of the occupants of the *Panay* was scrap iron in the United States in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1937, gathered up in response to the high prices which were available and exported to Japan in unheard-of quantities.

Is there any good excuse for a nation which prides itself on its intelligence and its progressiveness continuing to make available to nations which are the troublemakers of today the instruments and supplies which are so essential to them in continuing their nefarious operations? I ask that question in all seriousness. It seems to me the answer is very clear. America's first obligation, if only to herself, is to cease the game of arming the rest of the world in such a way as better to prepare other nations to attack us and make trouble for us at some time in the future. I insist that the program of putting an end to supplying foreign requirements for armaments, and the other steps I have proposed, are essential to any reasonable program of national defense.

In addition, besides maintaining the portions of our neutrality law which are not in dispute, we ought to enlarge upon that law. We ought to strengthen it, at least to the extent of removing the remaining elements of discretion in the law.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield.

Mr. POPE. Does the Senator think the time has come for us to reconsider our so-called neutrality law which was passed some time ago?

Mr. NYE. I am ready to agree that reconsideration is invited as respects the phase of the law dealing with civil wars in other lands. Beyond that, except for the removal of certain discretions in the law, I think no remodeling or reshaping of policy is called for at the present time.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Gladly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The Senator has just attacked the right to make profits out of war. The Senator realizes, of course,

that that is a "divine right" which must not be disturbed, so say the profiteers.

Mr. NYE. I presume it is generally considered that the right to make profit out of war is a "divine right." I know the Senator from Minnesota does not entertain any such conviction. I know I do not. I do not believe the majority of the Members of the Congress, or even a small proportion of the Members of the Congress, believe in the right of anyone to profit out of the blood which the Nation spills in time of war.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. POPE. I understood the Senator to say that he thought a reconsideration of our neutrality law so far as civil wars are concerned might be in order. In what way? Would the Senator make some discrimination between the sides in a civil war for any reason?

Mr. NYE. No; I think I should not discriminate. I think I should not provide any different treatment for one side than for the other in a civil war. I may say to the Senator, however, that I hope within a few days to speak at some length upon that general subject, with particular reference to the situation in Spain and the effect of our policy upon that situation.

Mr. POPE. The Senator does not feel, does he, that we should determine which side is the aggressor in a civil war, and ship supplies and munitions to the victim and not to the aggressor?

Mr. NYE. No; I am not ready to grant to anyone the right of discrimination, or the right to undertake to determine who is the aggressor in any conflict.

Mr. POPE. Would the Senator make any determination as to which side represented a democratic form of government, as against a fascist or undemocratic form of government, in shipping arms?

Mr. NYE. I do not think I should do so. The Senator puts his question very directly and specifically; so much so that I am inclined to ask him how many so-called democracies in the world he is ready to acknowledge as democracies as we commonly understand the term. I am not ready to try to determine such questions which ought to be left more largely to the determination of the people who have to live under the particular governments. However, as a result of our neutrality policy, plus the act of last January 8, by which we fixed embargoes against exportations to Spain, we have very definitely and completely altered what had theretofore been the policy of the United States Government through all the ages, a policy of recognizing the existing order of government, as we recognized the Government of Spain up until last January. By reason of our act in January and the inclusion of the provisions relating to civil wars in our neutrality act, I think we have worked grave injustice upon a duly constituted government, and we have worked an injustice upon ourselves and our own traditions in America.

Mr. President, the suggestions I have made as to a program designed to afford a more adequate national defense for the United States without cost to the United States must not be accepted as anything resembling a cure-all for war. That it is not in any degree. Yet it would, I am sure, eliminate so largely the danger of our country ever having to participate in another war that it would seem to me the program, as a whole, merits devoted consideration by the Congress, to the end that the worth-while features might be incorporated into the law of the land as quickly as is possible.

Of course, certain features of that program involve departures; for example, the policy which would have the Government more largely manufacture its own national-defense requirements; yet that would not be a complete departure, for in virtually all fields of military preparation, notably in powder manufacture, gun manufacture, and shipbuilding, the United States is already engaged in a very large way. I think it ought to be in that field to the extent of providing our full requirements at all times. But the moment it is

suggested that the Government provide its own national-defense requirements, without acknowledging that the Government is already doing it in part, influences assert themselves, insistence grows that we must not do anything of that kind, because it would constitute, to a degree, socialism, and we do not want any of that in our country. Mr. President, we had better have some of that in this country or we are going to find those whose dependence is upon war and preparation for war constantly agitating and forcing this country first into arms races and then into the wars to which arms races inevitably lead. Nationalization, men say, should not be contemplated. There must be found another way around it. We have tried to find other ways around it. The Congress has written into its national-defense program and has surrounded its appropriations with safeguards intended to avoid the wastefulness, intended to avoid the frauds that have been practiced against the Government by the shipbuilding interests of this country. Yet our provisions have been of little or no avail in restricting or limiting profits, and they have been of little or no avail in determining what are the actual costs of producing ships for the United States Government.

If we continue without resort to a changed program of this kind, we ought to learn to like the things that are taking place in this world today, for we found, for example, our own country within the year seriously contemplating building some ships for the Russian Navy here in the United States; we found our Government seriously considering loaning some American naval vessels to a South American republic. What kind of consideration is it that lets us contemplate the possibility of arming other nations with instruments which by chance some day may be used against us?

Recently a visitor abroad observed a most interesting thing in one land. He found under construction in Switzerland a gigantic seaplane. It was being built in a German-owned factory in Switzerland; it was being built not for Germany, not for Switzerland, but for Yugoslavia. The labor that was being employed in turning out that great seaplane was German, Swiss, and Austrian; the ship was being fitted with French motors; it had already had mounted in it machine guns manufactured in Sweden; it was ready for launching, except for the absence of the propellers, delivery of which was being awaited from a British corporation that was turning out propellers under a license sold to it by an American corporation.

That kind of thing is going on all over this world day after day and day after day, and the naval authorities tell us that we must not do anything about it, that we cannot do anything about it, because it is to our advantage to continue in the business of arming the rest of the world, so that we may more accurately watch over what the rest of the world is doing and win quicker access to their new inventions for our own advantage by reason of that kind of a course.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then, the armament trust is an international institution, a world-wide institution, that seeks a profit everywhere in every land under the sun; it has no flag; it knows no patriotism, and it worships no god but the god of gold, as I understand?

Mr. NYE. Exactly. I do not have with me here but I have in my possession actual photographs that tell a most interesting story. I recall one photograph of a great gun before which many British soldiers laid down their lives before the British captured the gun. With the war ended, the survivors of that battle thought how nice it would be if they could take that gun which they had captured back to their home community in Britain, mount it, erect it in the town square, in the park, as a monument to the buddies who were not able to come back. It stands there thus mounted today; engraved on the side of the great barrel of that gun are the names of those of that community who laid down their lives before it, and on the butt end of the gun, deeply engraved, is the name of the British corporation that manufactured and sold that gun to the nation that ultimately used it against

the sons of the fathers whose labor had made the gun possible. Endless experiences of that kind could be recited.

An investigation conducted by the Senate some 3 years ago finally had the result of awakening the British authorities to a course of conduct somewhat resembling an investigation over there. The British investigation revealed that British sons had been shot in France by bullets that had been manufactured in Great Britain. A great protest, a profound spirit of resentment arose. It became so vocal that there seemed to be something in the way of a revolution about to develop. In the Parliament so much was that true that the Minister of War of Great Britain appeared before Parliament and delivered himself of an explanation, his explanation being this, "Yes, it is true that British sons were killed by British bullets in that war, but," he said, "after all, it matters little to these boys whether death came to them from a German bullet or from a British bullet." Such is the cold-blooded consideration that will not permit any cessation of the mad race that civilization pursues today of arming all the world against itself.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then, as I understand, patriotism is of no concern to the armament makers; they are not concerned with the sons of Great Britain or the sons of America or the sons of any other country; but they are concerned with profits?

Mr. NYE. The Senator has put it well. The one interest that motivates those people is the interest of profit. It hurts to find the authorities to whom we look for our leadership in matters of such importance as national defense occupying a position which has them holding a constant brief for these very same profiteers.

I have before me a clipping from the Army and Navy Journal which undertakes to put at rest for all time the thought that there is any advantage to be gained out of a program of nationalizing any part of the armament industry. In that article I find this paragraph:

A perspective is hard to maintain amid wild claims and counter claims. We have often heard arguments that collusion by munitions men was indicated in the World War because the French and Germans did not fire on coal and iron fields. A little thought will throw light on that. Naturally each side desired to save such fields, believing it had a chance to take them for its own use, an accomplishment that would have ended the war in a hurry.

I wonder if Members of the Senate measure the importance of that expression? Here was the charge that the munitions plants on each side of the lines for 4 years were not fired on; that the safest place at the front every hour of every day was under the roof of a munitions plant. Here was the charge that neither side was trying to destroy the coal and iron fields of the other side; that they never dropped shells where they would interfere with those industries. Along comes the authority I have just quoted, saying that that is understandable; that they did not want to destroy the things they hoped to take, and that if they could take those things they could end the war in a hurry. If war can be ended in a hurry by taking the coal and the iron fields of others away from them, why cannot war be ended in an equal hurry by destroying the utility of those properties to one's enemies?

Who is the authority for the expression I have read? Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord. And so it is all over the world, too often, that military and naval authorities rally to the defense of a private industry which reaps a never-ending profit out of the fears of nations, out of their preparations for war, and then out of their engagement in war.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] puts his finger very, very definitely upon the fault when he points to the motive of profit. We came out of the World War with an awful depression on our hands. We slashed at it here year after year and made no inroads upon it. Five years ago we conceived the idea that the way really to take this troublemaker out of circulation, and substitute prosperity in its place, was to engage in a gigantic public-works program, in

which I concurred, which I gladly supported and will do so again. The first act under that public-works authority, even before the Public Works Administration was set up, was an Executive order by the President of the United States appropriating \$231,000,000 to the United States Navy to be used in building more ships to get ready for more war, all for the purpose of meeting the depression that the last war caused us.

Mr. President, I make this point because I wish to further the suggestion which the Senator from Minnesota has made regarding the element of profit. I want him to see what happened after this allocation of money. I want him to see how private industries grabbed and played their game to get huge, unbelievable profits out of these mad defense programs.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am very happy to get the facts on that point from the Senator. However, it now appears, does it not, that all the ships which have been constructed with the \$231,000,000 are not enough? Was there not a time a short while ago, however, when we had too many ships, when our Navy was too large?

Mr. NYE. The Senator refers to the time when we had to sink some of them?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes. Then we took \$200,000,000 worth of warships out into the Atlantic Ocean and sank them. One of the ships, the *Washington*, cost \$40,000,000; yet in the midst of the unemployment, starvation, misery, and poverty of the American people we took this costly, valuable ship, built by the energy and industry and money of the American people, out into the ocean and sank it. Now we are engaged in a very intellectual debate on all sides here in connection with the creation of a bigger Navy because we sank a part of our Navy a while ago.

Mr. NYE. Only yesterday the Senator heard the chairman of the committee which has had this bill under consideration make the point that we are today in a very, very weak position to demand any consideration on the part of other powers that would accomplish a limitation program in these armament races because we have not a sufficiency of strength so that we can afford to agree to scrap some more vessels—the very same things of which the Senator has just been speaking.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Senator only in part misquoted me. I said my information was that that was our experience at past conferences.

Mr. NYE. That we were without adequacy of defense, or without an advantage which would let us have trading stock in these conferences?

Mr. WALSH. My information is that the reason for the failure of the conference in 1926, which was a complete failure, and the reason why no special progress was made by the conference of 1930, and the reason for the failure of the 1936 conference, was in part the fact that on each occasion our Navy was so far below the 5-5-3 ratio that the only proposition looking toward further limitation of naval armaments involved scrapping by Great Britain and Japan, and not by us.

Mr. NYE. Then does it follow that the only way in which we can hope to plead and appeal to other nations to stop arming is for us to have more armaments than they have?

Mr. WALSH. No; but it is conclusive proof, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the treaties have now expired, that there is nothing for us to do except to establish some kind of a naval program, or let our Navy deteriorate, let it slip back far below the 5-5-3 ratio, or do what this bill proposes to do—to approach, in view of the naval building of other nations, a continuation on our part of the 5-5-3 ratio.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that when the navy of a foreign power approaches the shores of the United States to engage in com-

bat it must have at least a 2-to-1 preponderance; and is that fact being taken into consideration when we think of the relative size of our Navy?

We keep our Navy around our own coasts. I take it that the American people built their warships for coastal protection and the protection of America, and not to wander all over the earth. If we keep them on our own coasts, the fleets of other nations must have a 2-to-1 preponderance, at a minimum, before they can even have a chance of victory on our coasts.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Gladly.

Mr. POPE. I can see, with the Senator from Minnesota, that the destruction of warships only a few years ago, and the building of more warships at this time, is an inconsistent policy; but I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota—who seems to criticize the Government most severely for sinking those ships in a limitation agreement—was justified in doing so.

I, for one, had at that time a great deal of confidence in a limitations program. I strongly favored it, and favored the United States doing its part in limiting our Navy. I am wondering if the Senator was opposed to the Washington Conference, and opposed to what was done under it, opposed to the policy then pursued. I was strongly in favor of that policy.

Mr. NYE. Is the Senator addressing himself to me?

Mr. POPE. Either to the Senator from North Dakota or to the Senator from Minnesota. I think the policy in question is inconsistent; but I think one who favors a policy of limitation of armament would certainly favor the Washington Conference and whatever was done under it in the way of sinking ships.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that I did not favor the Washington Conference. I shall never favor any conference which proposes to scrap a larger proportion of our ships than other countries scrap. I am exceedingly doubtful of the wisdom of ever scrapping any of our ships.

We have had plenty of experience with foreign diplomats. Diplomacy seems to be the art of skillful falsehood. It involves our sitting down at tables with foreign diplomats and believing them as against the best interests of our country.

At the time of the Washington Conference our Navy was first among the navies of the world. It was not to the interest of foreign countries to have the American Navy the greatest navy, so they came over and got us around the table, and with their blandishments induced us to cut down our Navy so as to bring it below their navies. Was it in the interest of America to cut our Navy below theirs? I do not think so.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, in addition to that we accepted such absurdities as, for instance, the dictation of foreign countries to our own Navy and our own ships that we must not elevate our guns sufficiently to hit the targets that may be before them, while foreign ships could elevate their guns. That limitation expired, if I am correct, on the 31st of December 1936.

Mr. WALSH. All treaties looking toward the limitation of naval armaments expired on that date.

Mr. LUNDEEN. That ended that particular restriction on the elevation of guns, too, I take it?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I hope that the American Congress and the American Government from now on will cease to permit foreigners to dictate to us or permit foreign governments to tell us how we may elevate our guns or how many ships we may build. If we permit such a situation to continue, we will be in the position to which the late Will Rogers referred some time ago. He put it about like this: "They have these conferences in Europe. We send over a lot of long-haired individuals; and when they get through with the conference, they have to borrow carfare to get back home." We have been bested at every conference where we sat down at a table with

foreign diplomats. Our conferees come back with the short end of the stick, and I am nationalist enough to oppose that kind of procedure.

Mr. WALSH. Is the Senator against all conferences seeking limitation of naval armaments and also against increasing our Navy at this time?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, who so ably presented the case yesterday, that I voted for a common-sense, reasonable increase in our Navy as provided for by the regular appropriation bill, which increased the Navy appropriation by over \$100,000,000. We were all for that because we thought it was necessary, and we thought that \$100,000,000 in excess of last year's appropriation ought to be sufficient, and we thought that last year's appropriation was large enough.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator think the present Navy is large enough?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield the floor?

Mr. NYE. No; I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If I may be permitted to proceed to answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts, I reply that with the expenditures for the Navy, which have continually increased as the years have gone by, and with the increase in this year's appropriation for the Regular Navy, without this super-Navy being considered, we will be given ample protection within our own territorial waters, as indicated by those of us who believe that there should be a line drawn, roughly, from the Bering Strait, or the island of Attu in the Aleutians, to the Hawaiian Islands, to Panama, to the Virgin Islands, to the northeast coast of Maine; and within those territorial waters we have a strong, invincible Navy that is unconquerable. Our naval experts support us in that view.

Mr. WALSH. If we are never attacked, we have an invincible Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not maintain that if we were attacked within the waters I have indicated we would lose the war.

Mr. WALSH. I certainly claim that a combination of nations attacking us within the area the Senator has named could destroy our Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I cannot join the Senator in that contention. In the first place, I wish to invite the Senator to name the combination of nations he believes may attack us.

Mr. WALSH. Germany and Japan, for instance.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Oh, Germany and Japan!

Mr. WALSH. Russia and Japan, possibly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The Senator says Russia and Japan?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; almost any combination of two nations, operating in both oceans.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I had a discussion sometime ago about the Russian Navy. Russia has the world's greatest Army, I understand—if the Senator from North Dakota will continue to permit me to proceed. I was speaking with an individual about the Russian Navy, and great alarm was expressed lest the Russians invade this country. I said, "I understand they have a great Army, but, as to their present Navy, the only danger I can see is that they may be teaching their Army to swim with full equipment and some day they might land in New York."

How absurd it is to talk about the present Russian Navy attacking the United States. And if we take the figures published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, we find that Japan and Germany together cannot furnish a navy which would preponderate or even have equality in attacking the American Navy within its own territorial waters. I think the Senator will admit that to be so. When a foreign navy advances to attack it must have a minimum of at least 2-to-1 preponderance when coming into our own waters. All naval experts freely admit that. Every great nation is arming against its near neighbors in Europe and Asia. They dare not and cannot attack us. These nations, continually at war among themselves, always find themselves exhausted at the end of each war and require at least a generation to

regain their fighting strength. Anyone who thinks can see that.

Mr. WALSH. The difficulty is, of course, that we would have to fight on two oceans. We would have to split our fleet in two, and our fleet split in two would be wiped off the seas by the Japanese fleet, assuming now, that they should meet in combat under ordinary circumstances and with half of the present fleet on each ocean.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that Germany will be able, within a matter of hours, or days, or weeks, or years, to leave her own difficulties on the continent of Europe to the extent that would be required to constitute a grave threat toward us?

Mr. WALSH. I do not.

Mr. NYE. Is there any likelihood that Japan, in combination with any other power on the other continent—

Mr. WALSH. I would prefer not to answer that question.

Mr. NYE. I sometimes think I would like to see them come, because I think there would be a grand party in store for them before they got within striking distance or smelling distance of any part of our shore line. They might easily destroy themselves before they got here. I think it was Gen. Smedley Butler who suggested that the best way to deal with Japan when she starts out on her naval madness is for our Navy to run just a little faster than the Japanese Navy until the Japanese Navy has entirely exhausted her supply of fuel, and the war would then be over.

Mr. President, I wish to answer the question the Senator from Idaho propounded, and to which the Senator from Minnesota has given his answer. I was not here at the time of the Washington Conference, and yet I am satisfied, as I recall my sympathies at that time and my sympathies now, that had I been here I should have been most heartily endorsing the outcome of the Washington Conference. I think all the liberality in the world was evidenced on our part at that time, and if we could be instrumental in bringing to an end the madness that had seized the world we should have been willing to take our losses along with others, perhaps taking larger losses than others did. I have no criticism to offer of those who at that time permitted the destruction of the vessels which were scrapped; but I am unalterably opposed to this country of mine trying to put itself again in the position it was in at that time, with the largest navy, the most to sink, in order that we might bargain with the rest of the world again to engage in a repetition of that experience.

The exact language to which we were referring as having been used by the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday, was this:

As I understand the situation, at all the naval armament conferences we have been at a disadvantage in bringing about a real limitation of naval armament, because, aside from the Washington agreement, we were never in the position to make sacrifices of naval vessels.

I insist that the Senator was arguing that if we were ever again going to be an influence that could accomplish armament limitation in this world we would have to put ourselves in a position where we could destroy or abandon more of armament than would be expected in the way of destruction by others.

Mr. WALSH. Or stop replacing obsolete vessels. That form of agreement can be entered into at any time without destroying new vessels.

Mr. NYE. Very well. I only repeat that I hope we are not going to let ourselves be drawn into an expensive program, oh, so expensive a program as we are started on here, building up a navy with the thought that perhaps some day the rest of the world will say, "Now, Uncle Sam, if you sink two ships we will sink one," or "Uncle Sam, if you sink three we will sink one." I think we ought to have learned our lesson in that field.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. Gladly.

Mr. POPE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator; the size of our Navy in itself means little. It is relative size, as

compared with the navies of other nations which might possibly attack us, that is important. The 5-5-3 ratio, which was agreed upon in good faith, I take it, certainly by our own country, it seems to me was a very fine thing, and if some sacrifice was necessary to carry that out, that sacrifice ought to be made. But I should like to ask the Senator a question. When Navy and Army bills are presented, year after year, we find them larger than the bills for the previous year. The Senator and I and some others are disposed to question the increases, if not oppose them. Yet the practice goes on. There will be a dozen Senators in the Chamber when the Senator from North Dakota discusses the matter, and when the Senator from Utah discusses it. There will be a very small number here. A great majority of the Senate votes, without the flicker of an eyelash, a larger Navy bill or a larger Army bill each year just as it is proposed.

Has the Senator any hope, so long as a majority of the Senate and a majority of the American people think that we should be secure through a larger navy, to accomplish very much by the speeches he is making here, or does he think that much will be accomplished by the speeches I may make from time to time? Just so certain as that he and I are here, the American people, and the people of every other nation, will attempt to secure themselves by ever-increasing armies and navies. Unless something can be done to give them security otherwise, as we do in our local communities, I wonder whether the Senator is justified in hoping to bring about any substantial reduction or stop this arms race by merely talking about it.

In the West, for instance, our people used to carry guns to protect themselves. They had their six-shooters and their knives, and whatever was necessary in order to protect themselves. If one talked to any of those men about disarming as a matter of good conscience, he would never do so. It would be necessary to establish law and order in the community, and provide some power in organized society to give him the protection necessary. Does the Senator ever hope to accomplish the purposes of disarmament without something else being done to give security to the nations of the world?

Mr. NYE. If the Senator is referring to complete disarmament, then I must respond that, so far as the Senator's days and mine upon this earth are concerned, we cannot hope for it. If the Senator has reference to the possibility or the hope of accomplishing any degree of arms limitation, I have to respond by saying that I have not any means of knowing how far one's voice in speeches in the Senate may be effective. All that the Senator has said is quite true. There is a very definite limit upon the influence of speech in the Senate, but however limited it may be—and I know the Senator entertains the same identical theory that I do—I for one am going to avail myself frequently of the opportunities afforded, if for no other reason than for the benefit of at least some of the people of the United States, to demonstrate from time to time the influences which are so actively at work year in and year out, and which are threatening and making more difficult the accomplishment of any degree of arms limitation.

The Senator knows, as I know, that nations send to disarmament conferences, to accomplish arms limitations, the type of men to whom the Senator from Minnesota has referred, and I think without an exception every nation places its first dependence in arms limitation conferences upon military men. If I am mistaken in that I wish to be corrected. Our delegates to disarmament conferences invariably lean most heavily upon the naval authorities who are dispatched as delegates or who go as experts with the delegation. What is the result? The London Conference was held about a year ago. The naval representative, who has been the No. 1 man at all these conferences so far as I can remember, was Admiral Standley. When he came back after that London Conference the New York Times reporter and other reporters greeted him at the port and asked him what he thought of the treaty that had been agreed to. I think the Senator from Idaho will remember what his response

was. I remember it word for word. He said, "I do believe we have not lost a damn thing." Mr. President, so long as that is the spirit which moves men who are sent by nations to accomplish arms limitation in international conferences, it is as obvious as anything can be that there is not going to be any arms limitation. Other nations are doing the same thing, sending the same type of men. Some go a step further and send the directors of corporations that are engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war, men who would be money out of pocket if any measure of arms limitation were accomplished.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. POPE. Does the Senator have any hope that that situation will be changed so long as each nation feels that it must have a superior army or a superior navy in order to protect itself? In other words, will not disarmament conferences be mockeries and will they not be ineffective so long as the people of the country generally and most of the leaders in each nation believe that their particular nation must have a superior army or navy? Is that not a situation which will prevent any real limitation of armaments?

As an historical fact, disarmament among individuals never could be accomplished until society as a whole decided to organize and give each individual citizen reasonable security. Words fell on deaf individual ears until society gave individual security. Will not our words counseling disarmament fall on deaf ears until nations by concerted effort give each nation security?

Mr. NYE. Perhaps the Senator is right in pointing out how difficult the objective is going to be of accomplishment, but I believe there can be larger accomplishments as first one nation, and then another, and then another, may be brought to a point where, in establishing their policing forces, maintaining their armies and navies, they put themselves strictly on a defensive basis.

I am trying to say that if the United States would refrain from annual increases in naval preparation, if Members of Congress and newspaper editors would refrain from making speeches and writing about the danger of war with Japan, the military crowd in Japan would not have the picture of armaments that such action creates to place before their people and demonstrate the need in Japan of a more adequate national defense to take care of the attempt which the United States is getting ready to make upon them.

Mr. President, this debate has taken me far afield and off the course that I had intended to pursue. When last interrupted I was undertaking to show first how we had convinced ourselves that in order to get out of the depression which the last war brought upon us we ought to engage in a public-works program to be used in part in building more ships, to get ready for another war, to bring on another depression.

We know now, and did not know then, that behind the efforts made with respect to a part of that public-works program were lobbyists bent upon seeing to it that there was written into the public-works law at the time provisions which would permit of shipbuilding. Congress was not aware of the fact that this money was to be largely used in a naval program, but when the bill had passed there was rejoicing in the head office of every shipbuilding yard in the United States.

One who had been very active in urging this thing along seemingly, and according to the record, was a chap by the name of A. P. Homer, an avowed lobbyist in Washington for the shipbuilding interests. He is an elaborate entertainer, and one who seems to have accomplished large results.

With the passage of the public-works program we find Mr. Homer writing to the president of a shipbuilding corporation in this country in a way clearly revealing what may have been going on. I shall ask, Mr. President, that the entire letter may be printed in the Record at this point, but I wish to make reference to one lone feature of it. After

glorying in the large sum of money that would be made available for shipbuilding under the public-works bill, Mr. Homer told the president of this shipbuilding corporation:

I think it would be very wise for you to come down to Washington in the near future and talk to the gang.

I am going to repeat that:

I think it would be very wise for you to come down to Washington in the near future and talk to the gang. I will keep my ear to the ground and the moment that anything starts that will interest you, I will let you know.

I repeat:

You had better come down to Washington and talk to the gang.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter written by Mr. Homer be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is, as follows:

EXHIBIT NO. 1577

[Letterhead of A. P. Homer, Washington Bldg., Washington, D. C.]
MARCH 14, 1933.

Mr. W. S. NEWELL,
Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine.

DEAR PETE: What do you think about our Commander in Chief now? He certainly has done one whale of a job and the complete response of the American people and their confidence is one of the most startling things that this country has ever seen. We are on our way and all of the nations had better watch their step because we have found ourselves again. From what I can gather we are going ahead to a full treaty-strength navy and we are going to do it quick.

I think it would be very wise for you to come down to Washington in the near future and talk to the gang. I will keep my ear to the ground and the moment that anything starts that will interest you, I will let you know.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) A. P. HOMER.

Mr. NYE. I hope Senators see the picture. Congress has appropriated millions of dollars, a portion of which is to be used for public works. The shipbuilding industry at once knew that there would be a large shipbuilding operation under the public-works program. Before the Public Works Administration had been completely set up by Executive order \$231,000,000 of that public-works money was made available for shipbuilding. There would have to be bids invited; and Mr. Homer is simply saying to one of his employers, "You had better come down to Washington and talk with the gang."

We had Mr. Homer appear before our committee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will remember well that day. It was a day that followed weeks of effort. The man was ill day after day when subpoena servers found him, but he was finally prevailed upon to come one day in the company of a nurse armed with a bottle of pills, as I remember, to sustain life through those harrowing hours. Among other things he was asked under oath was, "Whom did you mean by 'the gang'?"

He hemmed and he hawed. He did not want to answer. If I am not mistaken, he said something about declining to answer on the advice of counsel; whereupon a member of the committee reminded him that a chap by the name of Sinclair had once taken the advice of counsel and declined to answer and went to jail for it. Mr. Sinclair went to jail, not the counsel, as I remember. We made that fact very clear to Mr. Homer. After a 5-minute recess and a further conference with his counsel Mr. Homer came back and answered the question, "Whom did you mean by 'the gang'?" Mr. Homer named admirals and commanders in the Navy Department. Among those he named as members of his gang was Admiral Standley, of whom I have recently spoken as being one of those upon whom we lean heavily in connection with armament limitation conferences abroad. The men referred to were "the gang." Why in the world should they be referred to as "the gang"?

From day to day the story developed. From hour to hour there was a little more light on the subject. We finally developed some very interesting evidence in the form of a

letter which had been written by Mr. H. M. Southgate, who was a Washington representative of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. watching in Washington the business of his company as it might be involved in these Navy bids.

The matter to which I now refer was an earlier experience than the public-works experience. We find Mr. Southgate giving some little indication of what goes on behind the scenes when the Navy is advertising for bids. Mr. Southgate wrote under date of March 5, 1931, to Mr. W. S. Newell, president of the Bath Iron Works at Bath, Maine. I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Letterhead of Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.]

MARCH 5, 1931.

Mr. W. S. NEWELL,

President, Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine.

DEAR NEWELL: The sooner you take the senior Senator from Maine out and sink him the quicker you will get destroyer business in your yard.

The naval appropriation bill went through the House with the Dallinger amendment omitted. The Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate under the able and progressive management of the senior Senator from Maine proceeded to insert that noxious piece of legislation that has appeared in the last few bills. Of course, he was aided and abetted by Senator Swanson, and I suppose that probably he may claim that the Senator from Virginia was responsible for all the trouble, but I rather doubt it. At any rate, it is now in the bill and the only way that you are going to get any destroyers built in Bath, Maine, is for you to compete in price with the navy yards. In the words of the act, you must be able to contract at a price that is not "appreciably" higher than the navy-yard bids.

I understand the morning after the bill went through every east coast yard had its representatives in Washington with their tongues hanging out and all teeth showing ready to fight for their share of the plunder, and the only thing that stopped the west coast yards from being here was the fact that they couldn't come bodily by telegraph.

All this looks as though you would have your work cut out, and also have to do some hustling right here in Washington to develop a situation that will enable you to see that the Secretary interprets the word "appreciable" in the proper way.

The Westinghouse Co. is going after the job hard. We would like these 11 sets of propelling machinery, and I want to work with you on the job, because I honestly believe that if you put up the right kind of a fight and don't try to make so much money that you will break yourself paying the income tax, that you will be able to compete with at least some of the navy yards. Only three of them, Puget Sound and Mare Island and Charleston, so far as I know, have had any destroyer experience, and the others may be a little bit careful in their estimating, although any amount of money will not make up for lack of knowledge and experience.

Be sure and let me know when you are coming down, as we must get together and see if we cannot work up something on this proposition.

Congressman French told me that he did not feel that the act would be restrictive and prevent the private yards getting their share of the business, but I think he is unduly optimistic, and that while the Navy Department will give the private yards every opportunity the whole question will undoubtedly resolve itself into a question of price.

Sincerely,

(Signed) H. M. SOUTHGATE.

Mr. NYE. I read only the third paragraph from this letter, in which Mr. Southgate depicts what occurred the morning after the shipbuilders had responded to the suggestion made by Mr. Homer:

Come down to Washington . . . and talk to the gang.

Mr. Southgate said in his letter to Mr. Newell:

I understand the morning after the bill went through every east coast yard had its representatives in Washington with their tongues hanging out and all teeth showing ready to fight for their share of the plunder, and the only thing that stopped the west coast yards from being here was the fact that they couldn't come bodily by telegraph.

Notice, please, how these businessmen who profit from armament programs regard the matter. Notice what they call the appropriations after we have made them. The programs lose their identity as national-defense programs immediately after the appropriation is made, and they become, in their own parlance, "plunder" programs. I am using their own language.

In 1933 the shipbuilders, in response to Mr. Homer's request, came to Washington, and they stayed here for weeks. They spent many weeks in Washington in the hot summer doing, I presume, what Mr. Homer suggested they do—"talk to the gang."

Then the day came when the bids were opened. Ten days before the opening of the bids, but after the bids had been submitted, Mr. C. L. Bardo, the president of the New York Shipbuilding Co., one of the Nation's leading shipbuilding yards, undertook to report to his directors in New York, writing from Washington, what he guessed might be the result when the bids were opened 10 days later.

There were three leading bidders for the Navy work—namely, the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., the New York Shipbuilding Co., and the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. Ten days before the bids were opened Mr. Bardo reported to his directors in New York. This was after weeks of conferring with "the gang," the men who had the awarding of the bids. I read:

I know from my talks with some of the representatives of the Navy who are keenly interested in this work that they are desirous of finding some substantial reasons for awarding this work to the largest possible extent to private yards upon whom they must rely for the necessary engineering to complete the ships.

In other words, "I know from my talks with representatives of the Navy that they are going to try to find a way to award these contracts more largely to the private shipbuilding yards, rather than let the Government yards do the work."

I read further from the same letter of Mr. Bardo to his directors in New York:

There was also expressed to us the desire that the builders themselves should get together and agree as far as we could upon what each would bid and then bid on nothing else. The situation as it stands now is substantially as follows:

Mr. Bardo, the responsible president of a responsible corporation, responding to the urge of lobbyists to come to Washington and "talk to the gang," reported to his directors that the Navy had asked the private shipbuilders to get together and see that they did not bid against each other.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator's committee investigate that accusation?

Mr. NYE. Mr. Bardo acknowledged having written the letter.

Mr. WALSH. Did the committee call before it any naval officers?

Mr. NYE. Yes; we had naval officers before the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Was anything incriminating found?

Mr. NYE. As I remember, every naval officer who had been mentioned denied that he had been a party to any such program.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator believe that?

Mr. NYE. Do I believe what?

Mr. WALSH. That the admirals or the naval officers were blameless and free from any undue influence?

Mr. NYE. I do not.

Mr. WALSH. Very well. However, the Senator took no action. I agree that great pressure and improper influence are repeatedly exerted by private special interests on Members of the Congress and chiefs of Departments.

It seems to me the Senator should have called the men whose names were given to him and should have found out if there was any misconduct or misfeasance in office on their part, and, if so, should have taken appropriate action. I cannot, without making a protest, hear the names of officers of the Navy, including Admiral Standley, who at one time was acting Secretary of the Navy, dragged in as being members of a "gang" suspected of being improperly influenced or controlled by private shipping or munitions interests.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Was there any evidence before the committee indicating that Admiral Standley was connected with any private shipbuilding enterprise?

Mr. NYE. No; there was not. The letter referring to "the gang" was written by a shipbuilding lobbyist to the president of a shipbuilding company. When he was required to name whom he meant by "the gang," he named naval officers, including Admiral Standley.

Mr. WALSH. He might just as well have named Members of the Senate as "the gang."

Mr. NYE. Some of the communications did name Members of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator suspect Senators of being involved in collusion with private interests?

Mr. NYE. I do not think there was any instance in which the committee even seriously considered it. But the Senator from Massachusetts could not possibly have sat day after day and week after week in the extended shipbuilding hearings, and encountered again and again and again the evidence of the work of the shipbuilders, the influence they exerted, and the hand of the naval authorities in the shipbuilding contracts without being ready to conclude that Mr. Bardo and his men were not merely talking "through their hats" when they reported to their directors back home how things were progressing.

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator that I concur in everything the Senator said against lobbyists. I appreciate the power and the subtlety of the pressure of the munitions interests. I am in full accord and sympathy with the Senator's denunciation of them. However, there is a distinction between denouncing them and putting the Government in the position of failing to establish its proper naval defenses.

IN MEMORIAM—JOSEPH T. ROBINSON

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the special order of the Senate becomes effective. The clerk will read the special order.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1938, at 2 o'clock p. m., the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting memorial addresses to be delivered on the life, character, and public service of the Honorable JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, in view of the character of the proceedings to take place under the special order, and because of the solemnity of the occasion, I ask that the roll be called in order to assure the presence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	King	Pope
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Radcliffe
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Reames
Bailey	Ellender	Lewis	Reynolds
Bankhead	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Barkley	George	Logan	Shwartz
Berry	Gerry	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Bone	Gillette	McCarran	Shipstead
Borah	Glass	McGill	Smathers
Bridges	Green	McKellar	Smith
Brown, Mich.	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Brown, N. H.	Hale	Maloney	Townsend
Bulkeley	Harrison	Miller	Truman
Bulow	Hatch	Milton	Tydings
Burke	Hayden	Minton	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Murray	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Neely	Wagner
Caraway	Hitchcock	Norris	Walsh
Chavez	Holt	Nye	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	O'Mahoney	White
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Overton	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been called to his home by illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, it is an indication that we have not deviated greatly from customs of our forefathers, when, in a world torn by foreign wars, upset by economic

distress, and confronted with labor conditions causing unprecedented unrest, we can still pause to pay tribute to one who has gone far beyond all of us to that haven where no worldly strife can enter.

If "it is after death that we measure men," is it the body of clay from which the spirit has departed or is it the spirit itself that we would seek to measure? Death is no respecter of persons, but is the one great equalizer.

The greatest emperor of all time is no greater, when his spirit has been released from his body, than the lowliest babe in his empire who may have died from starvation. "Dust thou art, to dust returneth," illustrates the fact "that all men are created equal." They live, achieve, and die, again becoming equal. So it must follow that a man is measured by that indomitable something within himself which made him achieve whatever distinction he may have attained.

The late Senator JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON, whose portrait has just been unveiled, to hang hereafter in the corridor of the National Capitol, was one of a large family, born to parents not blessed with great worldly goods, but having the spirit of real pioneers, the spirit which is a compound of honesty, courage, and endurance. The facilities for education in those days were not very accessible, but this son managed to fit himself for the practice of law.

His natural ability, combined with a pleasing personality, soon led him into the field of politics. He served with distinction as a Member of the National House of Representatives for many years, became Governor of our State, was speedily promoted to the Senate, where he served continuously until the day of his death, July 14, 1937. As minority leader, the position to which he was called by his colleagues in 1922, he displayed marked ability in handling men and legislation.

When the Democrats came into power in 1932, he was the unanimous choice for the majority leadership. How faithfully he performed that service is indelibly written in the history of this administration. He was unwavering in his allegiance to a democratic form of government and to his party's policies. I am free to say that he carried a burden of responsibility exceeded by none, not even that of the Chief Executive. So when we come to measure this man after death, we measure him by those outstanding qualities of spirit, courage, honesty, clear thinking, loyalty to our country, our State, and our people, and mark him as a man deserving of our respect and affection, worthy of all the honors and eulogies that we, his friends, can bestow.

Mr. E. R. Robinson, of Lonoke, Ark., who is a man of deep feeling, wrote that he designates a character etching of his brother. I shall quote here a part of what he has written:

ETCHING

This etching comes from one who knew him best;
Who tolled beside him, shared his home in youth,
His struggles to attain his aims, his quest
For worthy knowledge, and for vital truth.
His faithful service to his fellowman
His high ideals held until the end,
His discontent against an outworn plan
A brother, comrade, and a constant friend.
In sacred fires of home he found the source
Of inspiration and the vital power
That made him master, steered his tireless course
From striving youth to his last trying hour.
Here he was drilled in deep respect for law,
Through strict compliance to a father's rule;
Around that altar he was filled with awe,
His character found here its shaping school.
A mother's love enshrined him in her heart,
She sacrificed her life for children's weal;
A mother's love played that heroic part
Which stamped upon his soul the martyr's seal.
He quaffed through life of that inspiring spring,
Of books and songs which mirrored the sublime
Stored all the lessons history could bring
Absorbed the light from every age and clime.
Though all his youth he bore the hardest toil,
Yet through its grind the visions which he dreamed
Brought flaming star to beam on lowly soil,
Thus drudgery of labor he redeemed.
Here is the magic wand that made his life
So great, gave him the power to lead great men,
Undaunted will amid opposing strife
Magnetic force, keen comprehensive ken.

To those of us who only knew him in his success, this little pen picture of his early life, portraying the forming of his character by associations and environment, gives us a better understanding of his reactions and his power of leadership. He had learned early that when one would govern others, he must, perforce, be able to govern himself. He was honest in his convictions and, therefore, respected the convictions of his colleagues. His was a warrior spirit, but with a sense of justice which disarmed his critics.

While I am speaking here of the late Senator ROBINSON, I should like also to pay tribute to all those Members of both Houses of the Congress who, after faithful and arduous service, have answered the final roll call, and wrapping the drapery of their couch about them have lain down to pleasant dreams.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote:

There is no death.
What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose portal we call death.

He, our friend, has entered that portal, preceding us by a few years or months or days. May we, when our names are called, respond "here," and enter into the last and greatest house with our escutcheons as untarnished, our records as clear, as that of this man, the favored of my State, a great leader, Arkansas' late Senator, JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure no one can feel more deeply than I feel at this moment the responsibility which rests upon anyone who seeks briefly to describe his impressions of, his regard for, or his estimate of a man such as the late Senator ROBINSON, of Arkansas.

We all appreciate how inadequate our mother tongue may be in portraying our feelings on such an occasion as this. It has been said that there are many languages that are more descriptive and more capable of intimate and detailed expression than is the English language in portraying the feelings of the heart. I am not fully qualified to confirm or deny that statement; but I realize how inadequate my own language and my own mother tongue is to express the sentiments which actuate my heart at this moment, standing as I do in the place which was so long occupied by my predecessor, sitting in a seat which I may occupy but cannot fill as he filled it during the many years of his leadership in this body.

Senator ROBINSON, during his private and public life, covered a wide field of occupation. We are all familiar with the hardships he underwent in securing the necessary education to prepare him for a life which was to be distinguished in service and in attainment. How many of our illustrious men have started life in the humble schoolroom with a little company of students gathered from the rural settlements, to become a sort of inspiration for their young lives, to be known forever afterward as "professor"? for, however humble the school may have been, in our youthful days we were taught to refer to our teachers as "professor."

Neither time nor propriety permits me to give a list of the illustrious Americans who began their careers in the humble schoolrooms of our Nation; and yet, knowing as I do and as we all do the subsequent life of our departed leader and friend, we may well imagine the admiration and the confidence and the reverence with which many young students in the State of Arkansas looked upon the man who was in later life to become one of the outstanding statesmen not only of his day and generation but of the entire history of America.

Not only was Senator ROBINSON the type of man who would inspire confidence and esteem and affection on the part of the youth of his State and Nation, but as a devotee of the profession which is sometimes referred to as a hard taskmaster—that of the law—he equally distinguished himself. I have often, in thinking of Senator ROBINSON long before he passed away, marveled at his ability to retain his close touch with the legal profession, because if there ever was a man who, in the same sense in which we refer to Webster and Calhoun and Clay, devoted himself to the career

of government, or politics, or whatever it may be called, it was Senator ROBINSON. After all, those are interchangeable terms. Whether we refer to it as politics or as government or as law, it all means the same thing; for in the dictionary we are told that politics is the science of government, and that a politician is a man versed in the science of government, which is only another way of saying that a man who is versed in the science of government is versed in the science of law. In the true and broader sense, a man who is versed in the science of the law, in the science of politics, and in the science of government is one and the same, because in the fundamental sense of the words they are interchangeable terms.

Senator ROBINSON was a great lawyer, not only in the practice of his profession in the courts of his own State but in his ability, with all of his arduous duties and his multiplied obligations, to keep intimately in touch with the trend of legal lore and jurisprudence, not only in Arkansas but throughout the United States. To me that was one of the things that stamped him as an exceptional man—not only lawyer but statesman. Within the circle of my acquaintance during the past quarter of a century, since I have been honored with membership in the House of Representatives and in this great body, I do not think I can recall any man who so completely combined the qualities of the lawyer in the deepest and profoundest sense of the term and at the same time those of statesmanship.

As a legislator, Senator ROBINSON carved for himself a niche in the history of the Nation which has been seldom, if at all, excelled since the formation of our Government. I need not refer to the measures he sponsored in the House of Representatives or in this body. For 10 years he occupied a seat in the coordinate branch of the American Congress; and with a zeal and a fidelity, an enthusiasm and a devotion never excelled, so far as I know, he gave all that he had to the service of his State and to the service of his country. In September 1912 he was elected Governor of Arkansas, and shortly before his inauguration he resigned from the House of Representatives; then, within a few weeks after his inauguration as Governor he was elected to the Senate. So, due to peculiar circumstances, which are very rare in their occurrence, within a very few weeks he had the distinction of having been a Member of the House of Representatives, Governor of his State, and a Member of the United States Senate.

I recall the circumstances under which he was elected to the Senate of the United States. If not the last, he was one of the last Members of the Senate to be elected by the legislature of the State prior to the effective date of the amendment to the Constitution which provided for the popular election of United States Senators instead of their election by the legislature. I recall that he had been elected for a term as Governor of his State; and when 2 weeks after his inauguration as Governor, he was elected to this body, there was some disappointment in the State of Arkansas because he had given up the governorship, to which he had been elected, to accept membership in the Senate. That disappointment was perfectly natural and easy of understanding, because his record in Arkansas and here in Washington had been of such a character as to give great hope to the people of Arkansas that his term as Governor would usher in a new day for the people of that great State. When the time and the opportunity came for him to be transferred here, I can well understand that there was some disappointment in the minds and hearts of his own people, because he had served for only 2 months as Governor of Arkansas. Yet as we look back upon his career we must recognize the fact that fate played some part in shaping his destiny, for he was destined to become one of the great Senators of the United States, one of the great statesmen of our day, a man of intellect, a man of integrity, a man of consummate courage, a man who was able to look down what are sometimes oratorically called the dim corridors of time and see in the clearest way and fashion the welfare and destiny of a great nation.

The course he marked out for himself, the pathway he hewed for himself in the forest of legislation here, justified the legislature of his State, and the people of his State as represented in that legislature, even after his brief term as Governor, in transferring him to this great body, where his character, his talents, his long preparation, made him ready for a most distinguished career.

Sometimes in our sober moments we contemplate the value of a man's life. How much is a man worth to the world? If his contribution to society and civilization could be translated into monetary value and measurements, how much would the life of Senator ROBINSON be worth in the coin of our realm? If he had devoted himself to his own private affairs with the same assiduity, the same industry, the same devotion he displayed toward the public welfare, he might have accumulated a fortune which, as we measure fortunes from a monetary standpoint, would have made him one of the wealthy men of the Nation, for if all the service he rendered to Arkansas, all the service he rendered to America, all the service he rendered to the world in his capacity as an international statesman, viewing the conditions of mankind in all parts of the world, could be translated into money, I have no doubt, Mr. President, that JOSEPH T. ROBINSON would have died one of the wealthiest men in America. There is no way by which we may in monetary terms value the life of any American.

Not long ago I stood in St. Paul's Cathedral, in the city of London. I had just left Westminster Abbey, where I looked upon the wax figures of kings and queens and historians and warriors, and I found it difficult to arouse much enthusiasm in my heart for these wax figures, much as I respected those whom they represented.

As I wandered through the pews and aisles of the great St. Paul's, built by Sir Christopher Wren, after the dome of which the dome of our own National Capital was patterned, I came upon Christopher Wren's tomb, and I read upon its face this inscription:

Here lies the body of Sir Christopher Wren, the builder of this cathedral. He lived not for himself alone, but for mankind.

Then, as if speaking to me, it said:

"Stranger, if you seek a monument, look around." "Look around" at no great equestrian statue built in honor of some man who drenched the fields of this earth with human blood. "Look around" at no monument built by the hands of slaves, as the pyramids of Egypt were built. "Look around" at no great mound like that at Waterloo, built by the toil of men and women, who carried the dirt there in baskets upon their shoulders. But "look around" at a house of God, built in honor of the Deity, which is his monument because he consecrated his life to the edifice in which he lies buried today.

As we contemplate the life of Senator ROBINSON, our friend, our comrade, our leader, I know of no more fitting encomium or epitaph than this: "Stranger, if you seek a monument, look around. Look around at a city in which he lived, a better city because he lived in it. Look around at a State in which he lived, a better State because he lived in it. Look around at a Nation in which he lived, a better Nation because he lived in it. Look around at a better Government, a more responsive Government, a more democratic Government, because for more than a quarter of a century he lived in it and was a part of it, gave of his mind and of his heart and of his experience in order that it might be a better Government and a better Nation. Look around at a better world, because in his relationships here, and his associations and acquaintanceship with the outstanding men and women of all nations, he gave to them such an idealism and impressed upon them such a high conception of public duty that he left his imprint upon the civilization of which he was a part and to which he made a lasting contribution."

In life we admired and loved and respected Senator ROBINSON. In death we honor and revere him. Many years will elapse before his equal shall occupy the place which he honored.

I am glad, Mr. President, with these humble but sincere words, to pay my tribute of respect, admiration, and love to one of the great statesmen of America.

Mr. McNARY. Mme. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mme. President, last July the sudden death of our colleague, JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, shocked the country and stirred the Senate to its depths. I have been here many years, but have never seen surpassed such general and deep-felt consciousness of loss. There are some feelings that time cannot benumb, and the years will serve only to heighten our sense of the worth of this man.

I became acquainted with JOE ROBINSON when I entered the Senate in the summer of 1917 and, seasonably following, we developed a fine and firm friendship which continued uninterrupted to the end. A short time thereafter he was elected leader of the Democratic minority and, by the force of public opinion that led his party to victory, became majority leader in 1933. I was assistant leader of the majority and later leader of the minority, and our positions drew us close together because of policies and programs which well-organized parliamentary parties must follow if their purposes are to be carried to fruition.

When he was minority leader of the Democrats in the Senate, JOE ROBINSON was always human and helpful, never badgering, never baiting, never biting at the program initiated by the dominant party. Then, when our beloved Senator was elevated to the position of majority leader of this body he was tolerant ever of the aspirations of the minority, and through instinct, understanding, and experience exhibited a sympathy and knowledge of those bereft of temporary control by political processes.

Mme. President, I am not undertaking to disclose the Senator as a saint. He had his human foibles. He had a fervent, emotional side, quick to strangle wrong; equally quick to combat the arguments of those who stood in his path. At times in debate his poise and innate judicial temperament were submerged by the resurgence of his emotionalism. Then he was the warrior bent on destruction. Master of inscrutable keenness and mental alertness, he possessed confidence, which in turn begat courage. These mental and temperamental qualities made him a conspicuous and constructive force in public life for a period extending over a third of a century. His nature was lovable, and the road to his heart was broad, and paved with generous impulses.

There was another side to the life of our beloved colleague revealed only to those who knew him intimately, and in this environment he was an exemplar. He loved the woods, the mountains, the streams, the lakes, and the sea. He had a kinship with Nature, and was enamored of the primeval and all that abundant Nature bestowed in flowers and trees, fish and fowl. He lived much in God's glorious out-of-doors, where there are "tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything." From such scenes he took inspiration and inculcated practical philosophy, which sustained him in many a tired and trying day and restless night.

As with all men in public life, his path alternately was strewn with tears and joy. During the last few years of his life, as leader of the Senate, his responsibilities grew manifold, but he carried them uncomplainingly, and never veered from what he thought was the true course when the welfare of his country was involved, even when personal ambition indicated an opposite path.

I pleasantly recall the words of one of the less well-known poems of Joyce Kilmer which our friend, JOE ROBINSON, recited to me on more than one occasion.

They say life is a highway and its milestones are the years;
And now and then there's a tollgate where you pay your way with tears;
It's a rough and a steep road and it stretches broad and far;
But it leads at last to a golden town where golden houses are.

Mme. President, JOE ROBINSON never wished to wear the crown: he never hesitated to bear the cross. He sought equality for all and envied none, and my thought is that he lives today in a "golden town where golden houses are."

Mr. BORAH. Mme. President, when word reached his colleagues that Senator ROBINSON had died during the night I think we all felt that a life had been given in response to the arduous call to duty. We know that he was fully advised of the threat to his health involved in a continued application to hard work, but, with unflinching devotion he remained with his task. The answer to the charge sometimes heard that public service no longer furnishes examples of personal sacrifice to public duty is answered by the life and death of our former colleague.

Others will dwell more at length upon the details of his long and successful public career and of the many splendid qualities which graced his private life. I must be content to pay a brief and simple tribute to a strong, brave colleague who met and discharged the heavy obligations made upon him with a fidelity to his trust which may well excite the admiration and the emulation of all who come into this body in search of worthy and lasting honors.

Senator ROBINSON was always just what he was—no shadow of display, no pretense. He was able, industrious, courageous. And he died with the deep respect and affectionate regard of the entire Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mme. President, I am very grateful for this privilege to pay my brief and poor tribute to the late Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON. Our associations and our affection for each other were quite remarkable. I met him first just after my entrance into the United States Senate in February 1913. At that time he was a Member of the House of Representatives and Governor-elect of his State of Arkansas, but even at that moment he knew that the incoming legislature intended to elect him as a Senator in this body. In that moment I was drawn close to JOE ROBINSON. I was even then impressed and inspired by his vigor of mind and body, his frankness, his sincerity, enthusiasm, and aspiration to take part in the great work of this body in support of the incoming President and of all his great and constructive work.

It was not alone, however, in his political work that I became so intimate with him. He was a man who loved Nature. He loved his fellow men. He loved the out-of-doors, the birds, and the animals, and everything that God has made. Together we hunted and fished. We have occupied the same room on our hunting trips, sometimes in beautiful homes, sometimes in clubs, and sometimes in cabins. We have gotten up together in the early morning, before daylight, and have had our breakfast together as we thought with pleasant anticipation of the shoot out on the water. Through the misty dawn in many a blind we have sat and listened to the whistle of the wings of the birds before light permitted them to come into sight.

I have watched the sportsmanship of that man on the hunt. I have watched it in the boat. I have watched it on the side of the stream. I have watched him in those times when the soul of a man is bared, but no selfishness was ever evinced by him, only generosity. Then any man watching him would say, "There is a true sportsman."

I had the honor and privilege of being associated with him under the great administration of Woodrow Wilson. I saw then in him those evidences of courage, of loyalty, of industry, of sincerity, and of greatness which marked his whole life. I watched him throughout those great days of constructive legislative work. I watched his unselfish and patriotic services during the war. I watched his efforts in support of Woodrow Wilson that there might be established throughout the world some instrumentality for peace that might put away forever, or at least for a long time, the sufferings resulting from war. I watched him as minority leader, when he fought with all the courage and fortitude and ability which he possessed in so marked a degree. I watched him as majority leader of this body when he led with a vigor and an intelligence that distinguished him

among the leaders who have served in this body. Yet through it all there was a tolerance for his opponents. Courtesy always abode with him. Back of it all, back of the heat of debate, there was the love that JOE ROBINSON had for his colleagues, for his fellow men.

No body of men ever responded to those characteristics better than did this body, because when it appeared that possibly the ambition of his life, the ambition of every great lawyer, was about to be fulfilled, and that perhaps the time had come when he would be named to the highest Court in the land, every Member of this body, without regard to party, without regard to previous disputes or contentions, rose as one Senator, as one Member, and assured not only the President of the United States but the whole country that the appointment of JOE ROBINSON would be approved by this body, that the customary reference to the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary would be waived, and that his nomination would be confirmed by acclamation.

Mme. President, I know of no such tribute ever having been paid by the Senate to any other man. That tribute stands so much higher than any we are now able to pay, that I feel that I have said all that I may say in this particular.

I think of JOE ROBINSON as the man that I knew, whose soul I think I understood, a man who loved his family, who loved his friends, who was loyal to his State, loyal to his Government, loyal to his leader, a man of courage, of fortitude, of integrity, and of tolerance. His family, his friends, his State, and our Government have suffered an irreparable loss.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mme. President, I first knew JOE ROBINSON when he and I were young men practicing law. He practiced in Lonoke, Ark., and I in Memphis, Tenn. The two cities are only 50 or 60 miles apart, and the law firm of Trimble & Robinson represented in Arkansas some of my Memphis clients. This was long before either of us came to Congress. In all his fine career, I never knew him to do a more proper thing than to secure the appointment as a Federal judge of the Honorable Thomas C. Trimble, Jr., a son of his former splendid law partner. This happened only a short time before Senator ROBINSON passed away. It was not long after he came to the bar that he entered politics, and for some years he was not actively engaged in the practice of law, but he had already made his mark as a splendid lawyer before he entered politics. We were close friends in those early days.

As I recall, he was first elected to the Fifty-eighth Congress, in 1902, 8 years before I came to the House. After he came to Washington he often stopped in Memphis to visit me on his way to or from Washington. After I became a Member of the House he did this even more frequently. I always esteemed him very highly, and for a period of more than 30 years there existed between us the warmest and strongest ties of friendship.

On the morning prior to the night Senator ROBINSON passed away he called a conference in his office of a number of his colleagues concerning the judiciary bill, which was very close to his heart. He complained of the heat. He was not very well, and rested his head on his hands on the table, but no one then dreamed he was seriously ill.

There never was a truer, nobler or finer man; never a more honest or fairer man. It is true that he was sometimes impetuous, but he was always sincere, and as straight a man as ever lived.

Senator ROBINSON was a lawyer of great ability. He had an analytical mind, and a very methodical mind. He had what we lawyers call a legal mind, and would have adorned any court. As we all know, it was the height of his ambition to become a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. In my mind there was not the slightest doubt that President Roosevelt would have appointed him to the Supreme Bench in place of Mr. Justice Van Devanter, who resigned. Senator ROBINSON's untimely passing kept him from realizing his greatest dream. Regardless of politics, I believe every Senator not only favored the choice of Senator ROBINSON for the Supreme Bench but was just

awaiting the time when the nomination would be sent in to give it unanimous and immediate approval.

Senator ROBINSON and I served in the House together for only one term. He was a very vigorous and active Representative, and stood high in that body. He became a candidate for Governor of Arkansas, and was elected. In this connection, it is quite remarkable that Senator ROBINSON was Representative, Governor, and Senator, all within a period of about 5 weeks. He resigned his position as Representative in January 1913 to become Governor. He had served only a few weeks in that position when Senator Jeff Davis passed away. That was before the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, providing for the election of United States Senators by the people. At that time the State legislature had the power to elect Senators, and Governor ROBINSON was elected to the Senate by his State legislature to fill the place left vacant by the death of Senator Davis. He stayed in the Senate for the remainder of his life.

Senator ROBINSON soon rose to high position in the Senate, and in 1923, when Senator Underwood declined to become a candidate for leader, Senator ROBINSON was elected, unanimously as I recall, to the minority leadership. As minority leader, he was a wonderful success and, of course, when the Democrats came back into power he was elected majority leader. Without criticizing anyone at all, I think I may say he was the greatest leader our party ever had in the United States Senate. Certainly he was the greatest leader I ever knew. All of the great legislative acts of the Roosevelt administration were passed under his leadership and guidance. Farm legislation, banking legislation, farm and home-loan legislation, the Coal Act, all labor legislation, railroad legislation, the Social Security Act, and all other kinds of legislation put forward by the Roosevelt administration were under his general direction.

As everyone knows, legislation under the Roosevelt administration has covered a wide field. Senator ROBINSON was an adviser in every instance. He became familiar with every species and kind of legislation in order to be able to take the leadership in piloting such legislation through the Senate. Some of the more important of these legislative accomplishments were laws enacted relating to agriculture, air mail, antitrust measures, appropriation reforms, banking, civil service, interstate and foreign commerce, crime, flood control, holding companies, home financing, labor, liquor, military affairs, national defense, neutrality, power—especially the T. V. A.—public utilities, relief, revenues, roads, securities, shipping, tariffs, trade agreements, transportation, treaties ratified, veterans' affairs, war debts, and a vast number of lesser measures as well.

Senator ROBINSON served on the Foreign Relations Committee, and took a great deal of interest in that field of legislative work. He served on various other committees from time to time. His aid and assistance to committee chairmen were valuable to a high degree. It may be said of him that he probably had more to do with more different kinds of legislation than did any other man who ever sat in the Senate.

His devotion to President Roosevelt was sincere and beautiful. He believed in President Roosevelt. No President ever had a more faithful, a more loyal, a more clear-minded, a more resourceful-minded, a more ingenious, or more successful leader than President Roosevelt had in Senator ROBINSON.

He was one of the hardest workers we had in the Senate, and no legislation was too small or too unimportant to receive his attention. He kept up with it all.

Senator ROBINSON liked to fish and hunt, and frequently did so. He liked to go to parties; but work was his first interest. He earned for himself a high place indeed among American statesmen. As a speaker, JOE ROBINSON was vigorous and often impassioned. He started early in life as a debater and was always willing to join issue with any other speaker at any time. He always gave a good account of himself in such discussions.

Senator ROBINSON traveled a great deal, read a great deal, and was a very learned and attractive man. Socially, he

was delightful and pleasant and in great demand in Washington social circles as well as in his home State. He enjoyed the society of his friends and they enjoyed him. He was an excellent after-dinner speaker and, as such, was in great demand. His family life was very beautiful. He had a charming wife; and a more devoted couple I never knew. Mrs. Robinson went with him everywhere on all his trips. They had traveled all over the world. His devotion to her and to her family, as well as to his own family, was very beautiful.

JOE ROBINSON's life was an open book. He loved people and people loved him. He was generous to a fault. While somewhat quick to anger—and I could never blame him for that—he was just as swift to make every proper amend. His mind was most remarkable. It was an educated mind. It was a mind which reasoned things out. He reached his conclusions slowly, but always thoroughly. He was ever thoughtful of his friends. To illustrate: He went fishing only a day or two before he passed away. That night upon returning home, tired as he was after the long trip, he took his catch around to a number of his friends. He was every inch a man, and a statesman second to none.

For several years Senator ROBINSON and I had adjoining seats in the Senate. He was always ready to listen to any other Senator who approached him. It is true that some too-troublesome Senators did occasionally ruffle him, but I do not recall his ever having said anything offensive to any Senator who came to confer with him. As a Democratic leader he was patience personified. I often told him I did not see how he stood the strain.

In the more than 20 years I have been in the Senate I have seen great men come and go; I have been associated with them for a long, long time; but I think I may truthfully say that Senator ROBINSON was "the noblest Roman of them all."

I had the same feeling for him that I had for members of my own family. I sincerely mourn him still. He was one of the most useful, one of the most successful, one of the most brilliant, and one of the ablest Senators who have served in the United States Senate within my time. Peace to his ashes!

MR. HARRISON. Mme. President, during the last decade JOE ROBINSON was the most influential legislator in the American Congress. He possessed such dynamic and forceful qualities, employed such studious precision in the mastery of every subject he approached as to make his legislative achievements preeminent in this generation. As a debater he will be long remembered, because he was forceful, logical, and convincing. He carried at all times a persuasiveness in argument which was inspiring to his friends and destructive to his foes.

His achievements were many, because he possessed the necessary qualifications and the indefatigable industry to accomplish difficult legislative tasks.

Imbued with strong personal convictions, but possessed with a spirit of cooperation, he often yielded to the counsel of others upon whom he depended. His leadership was all the more successful because he sought the advice of his fellow Senators. He was never hasty in reaching a conclusion or formulating a plan of party policy. He was practical in the truest sense. How often while leader did he call around him the steering committee, or those of his colleagues upon whom he relied, telling them of the magnitude of the problem he was called upon to solve, and without suggesting a formula, first invite frank, free, and full discussion of the subject? He was a good listener and open at all times to the counsel and suggestions of his colleagues. Because of his admirable traits of leadership and the legislative achievements under his guidance his name will go down as one of the great statesmen of his day and generation.

But why particularize his career when he was, it seems only yesterday, so close to us, and his accomplishments are so fresh and numerous that for me to say more would be superfluous?

While I admired his strong and unusual qualities as a statesman, it was as a friend that I valued him most. For

more than a quarter of a century he and I served in the two Houses of Congress together, fought political battles together, fished and hunted, golfed, played, and journeyed together. He was one of the most agreeable companions and finest friends that ever lived. He was gentle and kind as a husband, thoughtful and considerate in an unusual degree of all those near and dear to him.

Others have spoken or will speak of the many places of high honor which marked his career, but I must repeat that I like to think of him and shall always remember him as a true friend, a real sportsman, and a great American statesman.

Mr. WHEELER. Mme. President, I am glad to have an opportunity to pay my humble tribute to the late Senator ROBINSON.

When I became a Member of the Senate in 1923 Senator ROBINSON had just been elected minority leader. I immediately recognized in him a master of men. Not only was he the leader of the minority party, but he also became, almost immediately, the majority leader of the United States Senate, for when he took a position nearly always the majority of the Senate followed him, whether they were Republicans or Democrats.

No one ever came in contact with Senator ROBINSON except to love and respect him, and very few men ever came in contact with him who were not dominated by him.

Senator ROBINSON was a partisan, sometimes I thought too partisan, but he was always tolerant of those who disagreed with him.

I admired him because of his devotion to his family; I admired him because of his loyalty to his friends; I admired him because of his great legal ability, because of the force of his character, and because he was a master of men.

As has been well said, Senator ROBINSON will go down in history as one of the great statesmen of all time. Neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party will ever have a greater leader in the United States Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mme. President, I first met JOSEPH T. ROBINSON when he came to the Senate in 1913. As a young man, then only 18 years of age, I shall never forget the kindly interest he displayed. Later when I became my father's secretary a strong personal friendship developed which continued until Senator ROBINSON's untimely death. During the ensuing years we often differed upon issues, but he was a man who never allowed the sharp clash of debate to mar his personal relationships with his colleagues.

No one who has served as majority leader in the Senate ever had a heavier load to carry than did Senator ROBINSON. The economic crisis presented a host of complex problems which have taxed the energy of every Senator, but the responsibility which his position entailed would have broken a man with less vitality and ability. I believe that all his fellow Senators, whether they belong to the majority or minority, will bear witness to the skill and fairness with which he met his arduous tasks.

Through the 12 years we served together in this body I had the experience of fighting with him and against him upon various important measures. His long legislative service and ability in debate made him a tower of strength in any cause which he espoused and a respected and powerful adversary in opposition. In running colloquy he was quick to seize upon any weakness in the argument of his opponent. He had a ready wit, and knew the effectiveness of irony and sarcasm at the opportune time in debate.

Senator ROBINSON was a man of natural dignity. He carried the honors conferred upon him by his fellow citizens and colleagues with simple grace. He was withal an approachable man whose personal charm and social qualities equipped him to carry the burdens of legislative leadership at a time when fundamental differences in points of view prevailed among the members of his own party in the Senate.

He was a many-sided man. Although an indefatigable worker, he was fond of the out-of-doors. A skilled fisherman and a crack shot, he enjoyed to the full every opportunity which his busy life afforded to take his rod or gun and spend a few hours or days with congenial friends close to

nature. He was interested in literature, history, the spoken drama, and liked occasionally to go to the "movies" for relaxation. He took an active part in the social life of Washington, where his long service had won him many close friends. Senator ROBINSON's gifts as a storyteller, and his genuine interest in people, made him a charming companion and a most delightful friend.

Fortunate indeed was the ideal relationship with his devoted wife. Throughout a long and strenuous public career they gave each other the combined strength which alone can come from mutual love and deep attachment. Having no children of their own, the Senator lavished his affection upon the boys and girls of his relatives and friends. He was never too busy to think of some kindness to the young people he knew.

Representative in Congress, Governor, Senator, minority leader from 1922 to 1933, majority leader from that year until his death, JOSEPH T. ROBINSON had a long and distinguished public service. History will accord him his place in the annals of the Republic. We who knew him will cherish his friendship and his memory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mme. President, I humbly participate in this memorial out of debt to a great friendship and in gratitude for a great life.

My affection for the late Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON is as fresh today as it was upon that burning July Sunday afternoon last summer when I joined the mourning pilgrimage of sorrow that followed him to his long, last home in the soil of his beloved Arkansas. My reflective estimate of his patriotic stature, his genius of leadership, his courage of battle, his implacable loyalty to his commitments does not dim with time. It grows with the lengthening years. Thus it is a joy to me—if joy may linger in the valley of the shadow—that the Senate of the United States should turn from the pressures of these engrossing legislative hours and from the cruel habits of human forgetfulness and should pause in reverence and appreciation before an honored tomb that greatly deserves to be a precious shrine.

Never shall I forget the shock and chill that took possession of our hearts when the dark news spread through a stunned and unbelieving Capitol that this sturdy captain of democracy had fallen in his sleep. No partisan aisle divided our riven griefs. We were akin in our burden and acknowledgment of universal loss—loss to us as a company of understanding friends despite all scars of combat, loss to a parliament wherein strong men are indispensably priceless to the destiny of a great nation, loss to the great America which we all worship with a common love. He had died in the very climax of historic combat which divided men as deeply as any issue can cut conscience to the quick. He had died, it may be said, embattled in his armor at the head of troops. But every vestige of the bitter conflict swiftly melted into armistice that brought all contenders to their knees before his bier, one spontaneous sentiment triumphant over all—"There was a man!"

Others, here and elsewhere, have dwelt in well-earned eulogy upon the honorable credits which illuminate and glorify a lifetime record of notable public service that took him, step by step, up the ladder of fame and power and exacting responsibility to a place of critical authority scarcely less important than the Presidency itself. It is an epic in the story of our land. He richly deserved every tribute that may thus address itself to these achievements, because he won his way to the confidence alike of constituents and colleagues by constant proof of unremitting and dynamic worth. No statesman more definitely left his mark upon the annals of his time. He would have made a great President. He would have made a great Chief Justice of the United States.

Others have defined his splendid contributions to the welfare of commonwealth and country. Others have justly assessed his commanding stature in the Senate Chamber, where he strode among its giants for many years. Whatever cause he embraced, he sustained it with superb vigor, with incorrigible loyalty, and with all the earnestness of his great heart and soul. He was ever worthy of any foe's steel.

I can see him now, standing yonder at the corner desk, eloquently demanding approval for his point of view, giving blow for blow in the blazing rigors of debate—powerful in physique, powerful in argument, powerful in conviction, powerful in command, powerful in influence, and—most important of all—powerful in character. All these things are history.

I could add nothing to this epitaph. He wrote it for himself. But I can give myself the privilege of testifying that from the first moment when I entered this Chamber 10 years ago up to the last hour of the last day when Joe strode his manly way among us—and he was just Joe to each and all—he was my sympathetic, helpful friend. Despite his high role in the greatest government on earth, despite his authority and place, he was simple and generous and kindly and companionable. He was considerate and helpful and gentle in his human contacts. He loved the great out-of-doors and reflected its strength in his own rugged nature. He loved his fellow men and reflected these generousities in all his human attitudes. I shall ever think of him as typifying the southern gentleman—the practical Christian—at his best.

Ah, yes! There was a man! There was a friend!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mme. President, I count it a great privilege to join in these tributes to the character, the services, and the personal relationships of Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON.

Mme. President, Senator ROBINSON as a Senator and a political figure was distinguished not alone by his adroitness in counsel but by his vigorous, aggressive championship of the causes he represented. He was a sage in counsel, and yet a Titan in debate. He was a man who was broad in his views. He was familiar not alone with problems of a domestic character but with world problems. He had traveled extensively, and he was deeply interested in international affairs.

Those of us who associate with Senators on this floor meet them usually after they have attained success. Some of us are thrown up here by reason of political convulsions, or accident, or chance. To me, it is always interesting to ask, "Whence came this man? Who is he? Where is he from?"

In that connection I like to dwell upon the life of Senator ROBINSON, which is a refutation of the theory that the small-town character cannot rise to eminence. I have been in his home town, almost a village, in Arkansas, where Senator ROBINSON lived until quite recent years, a town of probably not over a thousand population. It was there that he practiced law. It was there that he rose to eminence in his profession, not restricted, of course, to the local bar, but having a practice extending over a large area. His home, however, was in Lonoke, Ark. It was from there that he became a Member of the Congress, from there that he became Governor, and later United States Senator.

There is an erroneous concept in the minds of some columnists and magazine writers that those who live in isolated or small communities are provincial. Senator ROBINSON's life is a refutation of that. He lived down close to the people. He struggled and fought in country courtrooms, and from thence on to larger forums and larger arenas. Frequently the man who lives in the great city is so busy with the immediate problems about him, and the noises and excitements and amusements, that he becomes provincial; his horizon does not extend much farther than the city limits. But Senator ROBINSON's ability, character, and imagination, with his books, opened up a vista not alone of his own State but of his Nation and the world, and his ambition was kindled and went soaring from this little village in Arkansas.

Senator ROBINSON was a product of a small community. He went to a small college. I do not know who his professors were, but I dare say there were some lofty souls amongst them. I remember having read some years ago about William and Mary College. George Wythe was a professor of law in William and Mary, and in his classrooms there sat John Marshall, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and other great men of that generation. I have often wondered

whether or not down in that little dim classroom in William and Mary the brain that moved the hand of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in letters of flame the great Declaration was not even then envisaging and arming itself for the struggles and trials of the years of the Revolution, and that Madison was garnering the wisdom and profound statesmanship that were later reflected in the Constitution, and as John Marshall sat there under the teachings of George Wythe I doubt not that his soul was stimulated and kindled and his judicial character molded long before he wrote the opinion of the Supreme Court in Marbury against Madison and McCullough against Maryland, and other great constitutional opinions.

I glory in the fact that in JOE ROBINSON there was a life and a character that sprang from right down among the people. He secured his election to Congress by reason of no machine. No great political boss selected him and elected him. No particular commercial or financial interest in Lonoke, Ark., could have dominated a district and placed their servant in the Congress or in the Governor's chair. He was instinctively a Democrat. He saw the people in their everyday life. He knew their hardships and their troubles and their trials, and instinctively he became a great Democrat.

Mme. President, Senator ROBINSON stood high among the great political figures of his generation. He walked with the great, yet he died poor. He did not capitalize his public service to his private purse. He died with empty hands, and unspotted vestments.

There have been some expressions here today which seemed to indicate a regret that Senator ROBINSON was not appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Yet I wonder whether it is not just as well that he was not. It is better to be worthy of and to deserve a seat on the Supreme Court than to have one. His theater was here. His stage was here in the forum. I rather fancy that had he lived he would have been a Justice of the Supreme Court, worthy, able, a profound lawyer; yet I wonder whether it would have added anything to his fame.

Mme. President, were I a farmer I think I should prefer to fall amidst my acres and my growing crops. Were I a physician I think that I should prefer to fall while on some mission of mercy and healing. Were I a soldier I should prefer to die with a sword in my hand.

JOE ROBINSON is dead. His body occupies only 6 feet of earth, no more than the humblest laborer in all the land; but his spirit outshouders much of the sky. He will loom larger and larger as the lengthening years stretch onward toward eternity.

Mr. DAVIS. Mme. President, the passing of Senator ROBINSON was a genuine loss to the Senate and to all its Members. When I first came to Washington, 17 years ago, I had the opportunity to know him, and from the very first respected his fine abilities as a leader and a servant of the people. When I became a Member of the Senate he was kind and gracious to me and did much to make me feel at home in this place. He was a staunch friend, a strong opponent, and a fearless defender of the cause which he accepted.

His devotion to duty was an example to all who knew him. He was an indefatigable worker, and, indeed, the very greatness of his labors and the intensity of his efforts helped to bring on his sudden death.

When the evening of life comes for each of us, as it must inevitably come to all, what better hope can we have than that our tasks shall still be found in our hands and our hearts set on the high enterprise to which we have set our faces? This was the lot of Senator ROBINSON—to be busy, tremendously busy, to the very end.

O Paradise! O Paradise!
Who doth not crave for rest?
Who would not seek the happy land
Where they that loved are blest;
Where loyal hearts and true
Stand ever in the light,
All rapture through and through
In God's most holy sight.

Senator ROBINSON has entered into his rest and into a larger place of affection and good will in the hearts of his fellow countrymen. His spirit lives on in this Chamber—a constant reminder of the high service a true statesman can render to his country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mme. President, the career of Senator ROBINSON was without parallel in Congress in certain important aspects. We may recall others who have served longer, we may think of some who may be regarded as more brilliant, and of others perhaps more eloquent, but we can think of none in the long history of this body, 150 years of continuous existence, who has been more diligent, none who carried such great burdens, none who pressed to successful conclusion so many great measures, and none who carried with him throughout so much of the confidence and the good will of his colleagues. He takes his place as one of the great figures in the historic Senate.

The career of Senator ROBINSON is an inspiration to every man who beholds it. It is a career of constant rise and honor, ever expanding in influence, ever increasing in service to his country, whether as citizen, Representative in the National House of Representatives, Governor of his State, Senator of the United States, and minority leader and majority leader therein. In each relation he quickly established a distinguished place, he quickly found, not in the acclaim of men, but in an inevitable recognition, the justification of his elevation.

His was no middle flight, and as I think at this moment of his career from a young man in a small hamlet of a mid-western city, rising after and in the midst of the hard days of the Civil War, soaring ever and widening ever, unbroken, I am reminded of Shelley's description of the skylark that—

Singing still dost soar, and soaring ever singest.

His was a remarkably sustained flight in ever widening and ever more elevated circles.

I like to think at this moment that there is no end of that flight, and that the spirit of our friend who here was visible with us so long and so happily will still soar around us and lead us on as by a holier and a more ennobling inspiration than when we knew him as he sat in yonder seat.

Senator ROBINSON was subjected here to the severest of all tests through long years, and in a deeply troubled period, tests, I think, by reason of the troubled character of his time, from 1914 to the moment of his death, more exacting than those to which any of his predecessors was subjected—the test of being leader of his party, the test of leader for the administration, the test of the infinite demands that are made by Senators upon such a leader. You and I will bear witness at this moment that Senator ROBINSON not only met those tests, but he proved himself in an astonishing way superior to them, and, after long years, more than 20 years of that testing, now that we see that he is gone from among us, there is not one Member in the Senate, and there was not one Member in the Senate when he was living, but would bear witness to the good will that he felt in his heart for the leader, whether agreeing or disagreeing with him, whether in victory or in defeat.

I suppose no man ever served in this body who had such a rare faculty for dealing with and differing with his colleagues and at the same time commanding something far more to be prized than mere admiration for his strength of character or his capacity for service.

We have heard on this occasion the language of something more than good will, something deeper than appreciation. We have heard the language of a profound affection, a real and abiding love for a man who notwithstanding all his rugged manliness, the great manly qualities that were resident in him, carried at the same time the antidote to criticism, carried in his very being, in the genial twinkle of his eyes, in the friendly touch upon the shoulder after the difference in debate, or the comradeship along the stream or in the field, something indefinable that justifies, nay, demands, the love of one's fellow men. I do not think

that we could analyze, I do not think that we could worthily bear witness to it, but we could not resist speaking of it.

Senator ROBINSON was cast in the mold of greatness. He had a great physique. There was something about him that gave one the sense of unusual physical power as he moved in one's presence. There was something of tireless physical energy about him. He was an indefatigable man, who at yonder desk and in his position of leadership day by day did probably more work than any five of his colleagues, a man who rarely became impatient, who rarely seemed to be hurried, and who on all occasions, notwithstanding the great host of measures and demands that confronted him, was singularly ready and never wearied until those last few hours in a great struggle in which he was last of all of us to recognize that he was weary.

He had a very great mental energy and a quick, comprehensive intelligence. He met the issues of debate day by day. You and I had the benefit of reports and committee hearings. Our leader had no such benefits, but there were few who could match him in debate on any question.

Added to these unusual qualities there was another quality to which I wish especially to refer. I think Senator ROBINSON was endowed with a phenomenal ardor. I have observed it amongst others, but I have never known a human being who had his capacity for ardor. One might observe it in the fishing excursion. With what zest and enthusiasm he went into that diversion! Or if he were called to the field in the hunt, none could surpass him in the pursuit of the prey or the joy in the pursuit, and none could quite equal his relish in the reminiscence of the day's excitements.

In the tasks in the Senate, day after day and hour after hour, through more than 4 years, with legislation of the utmost importance and the greatest sort of variety being poured into the arena, in such a stream, and of such a newness as the Congress has never known before, and had never suspected could be possible, he met the demands of it all, and he met them with his whole heart, his whole mind, and soul, and being. That was his ardor, and that was the secret of his power and his greatness.

He reminded me of Lord Nelson's definition of honor. Lord Nelson always told his sailors and his captains that they had not discharged the obligations of honor in battle until they had exposed themselves in the utmost degree to the enemy, and had done everything that men could do to win the battle, regardless of the consequences to themselves. The great admiral's conception of honor was that in the conflict he who fought should consider no exits, no means of escape. You and I bear witness that as our friend did battle here he threw into the battle every ounce of his whole being—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. He seemed fully taken up and carried away with it. He staked all upon the issue.

I think that brings us to the fact that most distinguished him and which most commanded our confidence. When Senator ROBINSON was there he was all there. When he was on a side all of him was on it. That is the great definition of character in terms of description. When he was on a side everything there was within him was on that side.

I remember Romola answering a question which her son put to her in the fourteenth century. He asked his mother how a man could be both great and happy. The mother discussed greatness in terms of her acquaintances. She said of Fra Girolamo: "Fra Girolamo has the greatness of integrity."

I believe every Senator will join with me in bearing witness to just that—that JOE ROBINSON had the greatness of integrity, the wholeness of all that was within him being just as it was represented to be. He was integrity in action.

Mme. President, time does not permit of a real effort to analyze the character of our friend. I draw to the conclusion with just one remark: That to all these great qualities were added a remarkable breadth of view and a beautiful tolerance of spirit. I think it may well be said that the sportsman on the stream or in the field was no less a sportsman in the

arena of the Senate and in the wider arena of American politics.

But it must be said that there is but one interpretation of his course here that is consistent with all that we know of him—and that is that he was actuated by a high sense of duty. He supported measures that were new to him in the profound conviction that there must be unity of leadership in a great emergency. This was his conception of his leadership, and I honor him for it and the vigor with which he maintained it. He was moved by no selfish motive but by a sense of duty in the highest loyalty.

He was overtaken in an hour of great struggle. His spirit had demanded of his mighty frame more than it could sustain, and it broke away. It is significant that a copy of the *Record* was found beside his body. He had been reading the debate of the day to prepare for the morrow. He was stricken in the thick of the battle and at the forefront. His death made history.

I think it is well with our friend. I believe it is worth while to remark that if we may believe the greatest Interpreter of life here and the life to come it is well with JOSEPH ROBINSON. It was that Interpreter who said that he who is faithful in a few things shall be made ruler over many things; that he who does well with the talents with which he is entrusted here shall be given larger talents with which to deal in the hereafter. He further said, "Whosoever would be first among you, let him be the servant of all."

Measured by the standards of the Great Interpreter, I think we may hold to our hearts the assurance that his spirit will dwell here with us in a happy and inspiring memory; that he is now a part of the living, historic Senate; and that he still serves, he still increases, he still grows, still rises.

In the words of Milton:

Nothing is here for tears, nothing to wail
Or knock the breast, no weakness, no contempt,
Dispraise, or blame—nothing but well and fair,
And what may quiet us in a death so noble.

Mr. HATCH. Mme. President, as one of the newer Members of this body, it was not my privilege to have that long and close association which many Senators have had with him whom we seek to honor and to whom we pay tribute. However, my association with him was sufficiently long and sufficiently close to give me a deep and lasting impression of what I think were the outstanding traits and characteristics of Senator ROBINSON.

I shall not attempt to restate or review the details of his life in this body or in his native State. That has been done well, ably, and eloquently. I should like to speak for a moment in, perhaps, a somewhat different vein, but emphasizing and again stressing the traits of character which spell the words which make the life history of JOSEPH T. ROBINSON.

Only recently, Mme. President, I heard one of the ablest, wisest, and most learned Members of this body, one of a philosophical turn of mind, discussing the subject of what imprint or impression is made on the lives of men and nations by those who serve in affairs of state. His philosophy was a gloomy one. It was the philosophy of the forgotten; for he said that all men, regardless of rank or station, are forgotten almost as soon as breath departs. So when I learned that we were to meet today to pay tribute to him who was our friend and associate, I could not help but meditate upon the words of the Senator who spoke this gloomy philosophy. I wondered if his words were true. Is it true that we are all so soon forgotten?

Of course, some men will not remember and will have no occasion to revere the character of such a man as Senator ROBINSON. Men who are weak and afraid; men who do not understand and appreciate courage and bravery; men who are dishonest or given to short turns and sharp practices; men who are selfish, mean, and little of soul and mind; men who do not admire strength of intellect and patriotic statesmanship—such men will not remember Senator ROBINSON, and in the houses where they dwell no room will be

found in which to store the memory of such a man as Senator ROBINSON. By them, and by all their ilk and breed, he is forgotten.

Notwithstanding the philosophy of the forgotten, it pleases me today to believe that there is a difference, and that that philosophy is not true. I choose to believe that the courageous and brave remember the courageous and brave; that those who are honest and who deal squarely with their fellow men remember those who deal honestly and fairly with their fellow men. Those who are great of soul, mind, and character remember those who are great of soul, mind, and character.

This is the tribute I bring to Senator ROBINSON. Among the courageous and brave, among the honest and loyal, among men of character, intellect, and vision, among men of patriotic statesmanship, the memory of JOSEPH T. ROBINSON will not fade away and die. Among such men everywhere he is remembered.

I planted a tree today
Where a tree had never grown before,
And it will live, I am sure,
An hundred years or more.
Children playing beneath
Will eat of the fruit of my tree,
Men will rest within its shade
And some may speak of me.

But on through the long, long years to come,
Surely I will not care
Whether men praise or whether they blame,
So long as my tree grows there.
And on through the trend of an hundred years,
Perhaps away
My tree will live and live and live.
I planted a tree today.

In the forests of men JOSEPH T. ROBINSON planted many, many trees, trees of courage, loyalty, bravery, devotion, friendship, honesty, and all the virtues which go to make a true and rugged American citizen. So long as those trees live and grow, so long will the memory of Senator ROBINSON "live, and live, and live."

Mr. GUFFEY. Mme. President, in the death of the late Senator ROBINSON the country lost one of its great statesmen, the Senate an able leader, the State of Arkansas a courageous, resourceful representative. His passing was a profound personal loss to many of us in the Capital City.

The memory of the late Senator from Arkansas as a statesman and an able representative has been recalled by those who have preceded me. It is as his personal friend that I wish to speak at this time.

Coming to the Senate as one of the Senators from a State with one of the largest constituencies of the Union my task at the beginning in serving my Commonwealth was to me one of gigantic proportions. My first duty naturally was to make acquaintanceship at the Senate, to learn its routine and the intricacies of its proceedings. Fortunately for me, one of my first actions upon my arrival was to call upon the leader of the Senate, who was my old friend in many political campaigns of years past.

Senator ROBINSON, in the genial way which made him beloved by us all, immediately made me comfortable, and expressed his pleasure to greet a Democratic Senator from what he had thought in years past the rock-ribbed Republican State of Pennsylvania. Naturally I was pleased by this cordial recognition.

This consideration by the Senator in the interest of an incoming Senator I learned, while at the time I thought it was personal to me, was characteristic of the man. I appreciated the genuineness of his interest, his solicitude, and friendly inquiries, and learned afterward in conferring with my colleagues that he was able to show the same interest in all the newly elected, and to help in assigning them to committees appropriate to their natural abilities and of benefit to their home interests.

What better tribute can be paid to a man than to acknowledge that you felt his intense personal interest in your welfare; that he took each individual case of an incoming Senator as a personal one; that he gave to its needs thought and

consideration; that he made you feel he was centering his interest in you; and that he was devoting his time and attention to aiding you in the new fields of public service which were opening wide to you?

Senator ROBINSON, at the beginning of his leadership of the majority party in 1933, commanded as leader the greatest number of Democrats ever elected to the Senate in one Congress. His many years of service as minority leader had fitted him for this unprecedented task—leader of 59 members of his own party. The task before him in finding committees that fitted individual and State qualifications for so large a number would have seemed to many men a difficult undertaking, but the manner in which he mastered the situation showed that he had been trained to handle these matters.

It was daily contact with Senator ROBINSON in the transaction of senatorial business, and a happy custom we had of lunching together very frequently, that gave me the opportunity to know of his ability and charm. It was this close contact that afforded me insight into his masterful strategy in engineering legislation through the Senate which enabled me to know the genuineness of his love for his work, to know of his faithfulness to party ties, to hear him tell the lovable and homely stories of the mountain folk, to hear him relate the humorous darky stories he told so well, to learn of his experiences in field and stream, to gain knowledge of his travels, to respect the logic and accuracy of his assertions, and, all in all, to be a better Senator for having had this association with him. It was this close contact that gave me the opportunity of knowing of his faithfulness to a promise and loyalty to a friend. It was these characteristics that gave me reverence for his memory. I am proud to recall that he was my friend.

Mr. MILLER. Mme. President, JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, foremost public man in the history of Arkansas, was born in the rural community of Concord, in Lonoke County, Ark., August 26, 1872. He was the youngest of 10 children born to Dr. James and Matilda Jane (Swaim) Robinson.

He was educated in the public schools of the State, the University of Arkansas, where he worked his way, and the University of Virginia.

His public service began at the age of 22 with his election to the General Assembly of Arkansas as the representative of Lonoke County for a 2-year term. He studied law in the office of Judge Thomas C. Trimble at Lonoke, and was admitted to the bar in 1895.

In 1896 he married Miss Ewilda Miller, the lovely and gracious woman who profoundly influenced the character and quality of all his remaining years.

From 1895 until 1902 he devoted himself most assiduously and successfully to the practice of law. In the latter year he was a candidate for Congress, and after a friendly joint campaign in which he and his opponent often traveled together, defeated the amiable and popular Col. Sam Taylor, of Pine Bluff. He was reelected to the House of Representatives four times.

In September 1912, after a brilliant campaign, he was chosen as Governor over a stalwart, able, and highly esteemed opponent, Hon. George W. Donaghey. On January 14, 1913, he resigned his seat in the House of Representatives and was inaugurated Governor 2 days later, January 16, 1913.

On January 28, 1913, he was elected Senator by the General Assembly of Arkansas to fill the unexpired term of Senator Jeff Davis. Thus he was a Representative in Congress, Governor of his State, and Senator-elect, all within a period of 14 days, a record unequaled in the history of American politics. But he did not take his seat in the Senate until a few weeks later, on March 10, 1913.

Those were stirring days in the politics of Arkansas. The brilliant young leader, flashing like a meteor across the political heavens of that State, led many to predict a meteoric end to his career. There were those who were moved with indignation because of his leaving the Governor's office, and they prophesied that he had gone up like a rocket, but that

he would come down like the stick. But he met the crucial test with poise, character, and ability; and the bright star of JOE ROBINSON's public service, growing in luster through the advancing years, was at its zenith when the dark shadow of death threw it into untimely and sad eclipse.

Five times he was elected to this body by the people of his State. In his last race in 1936, in which he was returned by the largest majority of his experience, again carrying every county as he did in 1930, he did not make a campaign speech nor write a campaign letter.

I do not need to say in this place that this was not the haughty and disdainful strategy of a proud master of an invincible political machine. Rather it was the natural action of a public servant who had confidence in those whom he served and who was willing to test the gratitude of his native State and the fine principle laid down by Addison:

'Tis not in mortals to command success,
But we'll do more, Sempronius—we'll deserve it.

Of his long and distinguished service in this body others have spoken with greater appropriateness and authority than can I. But as his successor, I take this opportunity of attesting the affectionate pride with which he was regarded by the people who so consistently honored him and whom he so steadfastly served.

It has been said that Senator ROBINSON was never a popular idol in Arkansas. He never cared to be. He loved many people and thousands loved him. He held some people in contempt, especially the hypocritical, but no one held him in contempt. He had his country doctor father's sympathy for the poor. He came to manhood in the bitter panic of the early nineties and was an economic and political liberal as a freshman Congressman. He was proud of his unchanging fidelity to the cause of underprivileged men, and in the last interview of a personal nature he ever gave he more or less impatiently admonished his friend, S. J. Wolff, of the New York Times, to review the consistent record of 35 years' devotion to the welfare of the common man.

But Arkansas respected her great champion most for his candor, his rectitude, his loyalty, and his unflinching courage. His friends love to tell the story of a pompous gentleman with important financial connections who came to him on a delicate and urgent mission. He sought the Senator's influence with an official of the Government, but with awkward condescension explained that he did not desire to use "political influence."

"In that event," said JOE, "you don't need me, for that's the only kind of influence I have."

The people of Arkansas respected JOE T. ROBINSON because over a period of 35 years he had the courage and the common sense to follow, in public office, the tart admonition of Emerson:

Go put your creed into your deed,
Nor speak with double tongue.

When the great leader of the majority was stricken on July 14 last, falling "with face to the battle," there ran through every estimate of his character and service, like the refrain of an old and noble hymn:

His word was good; his courage unflinching; his character was granite.

Men might differ in their estimates of his intellectual endowments, his insight into the hopes and aspirations of humanity, and the quality of his political faith, but with one accord they echoed the unforgettable tribute paid by Antony to Brutus:

The elements (were)
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Here was a public servant who believed that a promise should be matched with a performance, and who regarded a pledge as he would a promissory note. He neither saw nor talked double. His capacity for seeing things in their true relation was almost clairvoyant; and his ability and willingness to express in blunt, clear speech his views on public

matters was a tradition in his home State, as it later became in the Nation.

In speaking of his passing, a great editor of Arkansas who knew him well, and who immediately preceded him in this body as the interim appointee after the death of Senator Davis, said:

The untimely loss of the leader of the Senate, the great lieutenant of President Roosevelt, is of deep concern to the whole Nation because he bore so large a part in national affairs. But here in his own State the first reactions are those of human grief and sorrow. It has been said of some beloved and honored men in history that when they died little children cried in the streets. There were literal tears when the sad news came that JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON, Arkansas' beloved and honored son, had been taken away. The people of this State were moved by feelings so deep and poignant that they far transcended all ordinary public regret at the death of a distinguished public officer.

His death was heroic. Into the battle he was called to lead he threw all his physical strength and mental powers, all his great personality, all his parliamentary experience and ability, and all his fighting heart—the brave heart that only death could conquer.

Many of us here today were at the grave when this great son of Arkansas was committed to the soil of the State he loved and served. I think there was something symbolic in the behavior of the elements that day. The great humidity of midafternoon, settling like a pall over the capital city and suggesting the pent-up emotions of the people, presaged the coming storm. The cortege moved from the church through solid lines of silent men, women, and children, black and white, rich and poor, great and humble. The last sad rites of his church were spoken with beautiful simplicity by the minister, who concluded with Stevenson's noble Requiem:

Under the wide and starry sky
Dig the grave and let me lie.
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.

This be the verse you grave for me:
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

As the final prayer died on the lips of the minister, the lightning flashed, "the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon" the grave of the departed leader. I could not escape then, nor can I in retrospect, the feeling that the sudden fury of the long-gathering storm was the symbol of the anguished cry of sorrow which rose from the hearts of the people when the gallant leader passed from view.

But the storm passed quickly, and the glory of a July sunset bathed the hillside and the mountain of flowers under which JOE ROBINSON was sleeping. Fragrant as those flowers, and warm as that sunset, is the memory of JOE ROBINSON in the hearts of the people of Arkansas.

And now, Mme. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1938

The House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday will be dispensed with and the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHARLES J. COLDEN

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have again been saddened since the printing of the program for the memorial exercises today by the passing of our distinguished and beloved colleague and friend, Hon. CHARLES J. COLDEN, of California. As you know, the flags are still at half-mast in his memory.

In deference to the wishes of the members of his family, the paying of tribute to him is being deferred until this occasion a year hence, when it is hoped they can be with us.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly, the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Chair.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

APRIL 20, 1938

Prelude, Sacred Selections (11:30 to 12)

United States Army Band Orchestra
Presiding Officer.....The Speaker of the House of Representatives
Invocation.....The Chaplain, Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Crossing the Bar.....W. L. Thickstun

Interstate Male Chorus

Scripture Reading and Prayer.....The Chaplain
Roll of Deceased Members.....The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional Silence

Address.....Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

Representative from the State of Vermont

The Lamp in the West.....Horatio Parker

Interstate Male Chorus

Address.....Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM

Representative from the State of Texas

Cornet Solo—Nearer My God to Thee.....Ralph K. Ostrom

Master Sergeant, United States Army Band Orchestra

Benediction.....The Chaplain

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

The Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Interstate Male Chorus sang Crossing the Bar, by W. L. Thickstun.

The Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery:

The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever. (Psalm 23.)

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past and as a watch in the night. Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they

are as a sleep; in the morning they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up, in the evening it is cut down and withereth. So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. (Psalm 90.)

There is one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. But when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory.

Almighty and most merciful God, our Father, from whom our spirits come and to whom they shall return, grant unto all sorrowing hearts the consolation of Thy grace. Strengthen, we beseech Thee, the faith of all bereaved ones, that they may contemplate with peace the blessedness of that eternal home which Thou hast prepared for all whom Thou hast redeemed. Grant that all others whose joy is turned into mourning may not murmur nor faint under their afflictions; but cleaving more closely unto Thee, O blessed Lord and Savior, who art the resurrection and the life, may be led by Thy Holy Spirit through all the trials of this uncertain life, till the day break and the shadows flee away. Amen.

Still, still with Thee, when purple morning breaketh,
When the bird waketh and the shadows flee;
Fairer than morning, holier than daylight
Dawns the sweet consciousness, I am with Thee.

So shall it be at last, in that bright morning,
When the soul waketh and life's shadows flee;
Oh, in that hour fairer than daylight dawning,
Shall rise the glorious thought, I am with Thee.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. A. E. Chaffee, reading clerk of the House, read the following roll:

JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON, Senator from the State of Arkansas: Lawyer; member of the General Assembly of Arkansas, 1895; Presidential elector, 1900; Member of the House of Representatives Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, Sixty-first, and Sixty-second Congresses; Governor of Arkansas, 1913; elected to the United States Senate January 1913; reelected in 1918, 1924, 1930, and 1936. chairman of the minority conference, 1922-33, and chairman of the majority conference, 1933-37. Died July 14, 1937.

PHILIP ARNOLD GOODWIN, Twenty-seventh Congressional District of New York: Businessman; engaged in steel bridge building, 1902-16; director and president of the National Bank of Coxsackie; vice president of the Coxsackie Milling & Supply Co.; trustee, Heermance Memorial Library; Member of the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. Died June 6, 1937.

WILLIAM PATRICK CONNERY, Jr., Seventh Congressional District of Massachusetts: Actor, theatrical manager, soldier, lawyer; served 19 months in France in all major operations of the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division; promoted from private to regimental color sergeant for meritorious service; Member of the Sixty-eighth and each succeeding Congress; chairman of the Committee on Labor. Died June 15, 1937.

THEODORE ALBERT PEYSER, Seventeenth Congressional District of New York: Businessman; special agent of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.; collector of etchings; member of the Jefferson Island Club and Wild Goose Club at Harmony, Maine; elected to the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. Member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Died August 8, 1937.

ROBERT POTTER HILL, Fifth Congressional District of Oklahoma: Lawyer, educator, police magistrate of Marion, Ill., 1903; city attorney of Marion, 1908-10; member of the Illinois State House of Representatives, 1910-12; Member of the Sixty-third Congress from Illinois; assistant county attorney, Oklahoma County; district judge of Oklahoma; Member of the Seventy-fifth Congress from Oklahoma. Died October 29, 1937.

EDWARD ALOYSIUS KENNEY, Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey: Lawyer; admitted to the bar of the State of New York in 1908, and to the bar of the State of New Jersey in 1917; member of Legal Advisory Draft Board in 1917; judge of recorder's court of Cliffside Park, 1919-23; Member of the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. Died January 27, 1938.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

Then followed 1 minute to devotional silence.

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, a Representative from the State of Vermont, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

Mr. Speaker, we have met once more according to our reverent custom in order to note the passing of the year and properly to observe the absence of those colleagues and friends of ours departed.

This memorial day is in some respects the most significant and important of our calendar, with its solemn and tender associations. Solemn, for it bids us pause and measure each for himself the duty he owes to a common country; tender, since it opens the floodgates of memory to a tide of emotions and recollections which bring before us again in form and in voice those colleagues of ours who "short days ago lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved, and were loved."

I see a hand you cannot see!
I hear a voice you cannot hear.

They have gone, but, as the poet has said:

Whatever comes must go—and so the rose
That for a little trembles on its stalk,
Dying, will cast its petals in a shower
Upon the garden walk.

There is no permanence: Impatient time
So swiftly shifts the curtains of life's show,
It will not long possess us, ill or good—
Whatever comes, must go.

And so today those of us who are still standing on this "narrow isthmus twixt two boundless seas"; the past, the future; two eternities, are living again those happy days of friendship, association, and fellowship, in the land of yesterday of memory, a paradise out of which fate cannot drive us.

Oh memories that bless and burn,
Oh barren gain and bitter loss;
I kiss each bead and strive at last to learn
To kiss the cross.

Those colleagues of ours. Once more we seem to see them and to hear them trying to make some nook of God's creation a little more fruitful, better, more worthy of God; endeavoring to make some human hearts a little wiser, more mindful, happier, more blessed, less accursed; striving to widen the intellectual horizon of the people, helping to lay the foundation of a better individual life, showing them new goals for endeavor; inspiring them with more varied and higher ideals—

To strive to seek, to find
And not to yield.

The good which these friends of ours did and tried to do will never die, whether it be recognized or unrecognized as such, for it lives and will live and work through endless ages, since no truth or goodness realized by man ever dies or can die.

Perchance beyond the veil unreal there lies
Somewhere fulfillment we now court in vain;
Perchance beyond this haggard life that dies
Dwells that for which our spent ideals strain.

There is no heroic poem in the world but in reality is a biography of a man. There is no life of a man faithfully recorded but is in itself a heroic poem, rhymed or unrhymed. All that history and biography and experience teach is summed up in the fact that no great freedom has ever been established by spontaneous growth, nor has it ever been self-sustaining or self-protecting. Liberties are rare plants demanding eternal vigilance and continuous defense. No great expansion or extension of human opportunity has ever come to pass by accident. Somewhere, sometime, somehow, some man has paid the price.

This is the inexorable and unchanging law. The advance of truth across the world has been marked by little circles of blackened earth, where yesterday the martyr stood.

America stands before the world as the highest and almost the only representative of a political system which gives each individual a common share of authority and responsibility of government. It necessarily follows that the collective wealth and intelligence of our people are but agencies

to conserve the rights, the principles, the liberties, and the essential dignity of man as man. The work of patriots is never finished. The theory of our citizenship is larger today than yesterday, and the inalienable right of the common citizen to life, liberty, and happiness has changed our declaration of rights into a declaration of obligation, and made it necessary for each one of us to bear the burden of the responsibility of the liberties which we enjoy.

As George William Curtis said of friends of his, so I say of those colleagues of ours, "To them the welfare of their country was dearer and meant more than any mere partisan political victory. This patriotism is scorned by some as an impracticable theory, as a dream of a cloister, and even by some as the whim of the fool." But such was the folly of the Spartan Leonidas, staying with his 300, the Persian horde, and teaching Greece the self-reliance that saved her. Such was the folly of the Swiss Arnold von Winkelried, gathering into his own breast the host of Austrian spears, making his dead body the bridge of victory for his countrymen. Such was the folly of the American Nathan Hale, gladly risking the seeming disgrace of his name, and grieving that he had but one life to give for his country. Such are the beacon lights of a pure patriotism that burn forever in men's memories and answer each other through the illuminated ages. This is the spirit of a patriotism that girds the Commonwealth with the resistless splendor of the moral law—"the invulnerable panoply of States, the celestial secret of a great nation and a happy people."

America has made her progress through and by the necessity and the agitation of man for equal opportunity and for individual expression, by the urgency in man for liberty to grow, by the necessity for man that political conditions should respond more nearly to the urging of man's inner and spiritual nature.

This day forcefully reminds us that heroism is not confined to the tented field and that courage is not required exclusively for war and death. Not every great cause leads to battle and to death and only a few are called upon to die for their country, while all of us are called upon to live for it. To die nobly is heroic, but to live nobly is magnificent. These colleagues of ours taught us how to live as well as how to die. They played the game until it was called on account of darkness. As someone has well said:

We play with life—a game that ends in losing
And yet still must be played, though cards are stacked.
What matter if the deal is not our choosing?
What matter if we play with bodies racked
By pain or filled with joy? The game is such
We gamble till death shows the winning hand.
Yes; truly we must trust God overmuch
To play a game we do not understand.
It might be that the game is never ended,
Though death may win from life, there still may be
A power beyond time, uncomprehended,
That does not fear to fight for such as we.
To futures that forever will endure
This life and death may be the overture.

These colleagues of ours were all strong, able men who exemplified the finest traditions of America's equality of opportunity not one of whom ever thought of himself as a great man. My friends, nothing is more simple than greatness, for to be simple is to be great.

That man is great, and he alone
Who serves a greatness not his own
For neither price, nor pelf;
Content to know and to be unknown,
Whole in himself.

We are more than ever this day impressed by our conclusion that the welfare of our country depends upon such men as they were; upon the courage and the spirit and the understanding with which we, each one of us, meet and discharge, as they did, the ever recurring, homely, undramatic duties of everyday life.

How well we know that just in proportion as each citizen, as the average man, may meet and discharge his patriotic duty and make the necessary sacrifices required of every unselfish loyal American citizen, to just this extent can the stability, the permanency, and the character of our institutions be assured.

Throughout the pages of history the force of dynamic personalities is projected beyond the workaday sphere of ordinary mortals. Their thoughts and their actions, because of the fact that their viewpoint is accompanied by a contagious sense of honesty, justice, and truth, live after them for succeeding generations to emulate and apply. The lives of such men as these colleagues and friends of ours, and their efforts, and what they sought to accomplish, or effected, in political, social, and economic institutions, make history.

They, each and every one of them, would be the last to admit it, much less to boast of the fact; nevertheless it is true that they inherently possessed those qualities of character which made them great in spite of themselves; qualities which at any time and all times in any person have won, and always will win, a positive and indestructible claim to a place among the select nobility of mankind.

We must still serve if we would save, still sacrifice if we would preserve; to get is not all or much; to give is the nobler part. License is not liberty, for anarchy knows no true liberty. Freedom is blessed only when held in reasonable restraint, and to obey the law, not to avoid or evade it, is the duty of all.

It also follows, therefore, that the rule of service and sacrifice, animating and controlling all hearts, shaping all actions, declaring alike the duty and ability of all, is the only sure safeguard of our American institutions, as it is also the secure and sustaining bulwark of this Republic.

As I listened just now to the roll call and no familiar voice responded, and there was no answer, I was reminded that from the date of his death on June 27, 1800, at Oberhausen, Bavaria, until 1814 the name of Latour d'Auvergne was retained on the roll of his company of grenadiers, as a mark of honor. At each and every roll call when d'Auvergne's name was reached, the color sergeant answered: "Dead on the field of honor."

So do we answer for those friends of ours.

As the poet would have it—

We met like ships upon the sea
Who hold an hour's converse so short, so sweet!
Oh, little hours! and then away they speed
On lonely paths through mist and cloud and foam
To meet no more.

To meet no more? Ah, there is the rub!

If immortality—

As Senator Ingalls said—

be a splendid but delusive dream, if the incompleteness of their human career, even the longest and most fortunate, be not perfected and supplemented after its termination here, then he who fears to die should dread to live, for life would be a tragedy more desolate and inexplicable than death.

The old, old fashion—death—with its perpetual, persistent, and ever-recurring challenge, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

From remote antiquity men have tried to find an answer to that question. Scientists and philosophers, Sophists, and logicians have pointed intellectual telescopes toward the inscrutable fastnesses of futurity, only to be thwarted and set at naught by that blank wall which separates the seen from the unseen, the fathomed from the unfathomable.

Strange, is it not, that with the inevitability of death always before them, men find it possible, under ordinary circumstances, to draw the curtains of their minds against it? Yet there are moments in the life of almost every man when "sad images of the shroud, and pall, and breathless darkness, and the narrow house" cause him "to shudder and grow sick at heart." And, however they may be formulated, these thoughts inevitably resolve themselves at last into Job's poignant question.

That question has been answered. But the answer did not come from the scientists or the philosophers, the Sophists or the logicians. It came from a Man in far-off Palestine nineteen hundred years ago, and He framed it in these simple but dynamic words:

Because I live ye shall live also.

So today we say with Dickens:

The golden ripple on the wall came back again, and nothing else stirred in the room. The old, old fashion! The fashion that came in with our first garments and will last unchanged until our race has run its course and the wide firmament is rolled up like a scroll. The old, old fashion—death! Oh, thank God, all who see it, for that older fashion yet—of immortality!

The Interstate Male Chorus sang *The Lamp in the West*, by Horatio Parker.

Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, a Representative from the State of Texas, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS OF HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

Mr. Speaker, out of the past and into the future come and go the children of men. In their brief sojourn on earth they learn of that past through history, of that future through revelation. Only in that present of their three score years and ten may they exemplify actively to their fellow men their bountiful heritage from the past, their blissful hope for the future.

Today we pause to meditate upon the lives of friends and colleagues who have completed but recently that interim between two great eternities. The records of service they have left, the confidence in their ability and integrity their associations here have established, the affectionate regard their worth as true Americans has invited and received now warm our hearts and will endear them to us forever. The memory of their loyalty to our institutions and our ideals will remain as an inspiration and a benediction.

With narrowed vision we are prone to regard such an occasion as this as one of sorrow and gloom. It is not so. The work of these colleagues is not finished, their course has not been run. No man lives here to see the perfection of his work; that is what eternity is for. It is not for us to write finis to their helpful accomplishment. It is for us, rather, to remember and appreciate their faithful service and to cherish the confident hope that even the cordial relations we have enjoyed with them are in recess, not in adjournment.

To this encouraging and uplifting contemplation I would direct our thought, that to us and to those assembled loved ones who suffer most the pangs of temporary parting may come the solace of an assuring comfort that must be real.

Long before revelation came to teach the doctrine of the resurrection, peoples of all races desired and believed in the continuity of life. Orientals cherished the firm conviction of the transmigration of souls. The ancient Greeks dreamed of a blissful Elysium, the Indians of the happy hunting ground. In the tombs of antiquity, food and raiment and the adornments and implements of happy and useful living were interred with the departed. To this belief in immortality the redskin sacrificed the steed of the fallen warrior, and the Arab the camel. Reason seemed the herald of revelation. The heavens had declared the glory of One Omnipotent, the firmament had shown His handiwork, and from the beginning could creep in no skepticism of that Supreme Existence that decreed the orderly courses of worlds and the orderly processes of nature.

And reason taught another thing to stimulate that innate hope. In goodness, and in goodness only, is there true supremacy. In evil there is depravity. Even to the ancients it seemed unthinkable that man, the highest order of divine creation, in attributes akin in miniature to the Almighty, could have been fashioned as an amusing pastime. It was rational to assume that he came as an expression of love and care and providence, with a purpose in his making, attesting the goodness of that One Supreme who would satisfy the craving of his soul to live and not to die. Even the low order of the vegetable kingdom, with its contributions of beauty and sustenance, taught the doctrine of its continuing existence. To the grain of wheat came death before it emerged into more luxuriant life. The heat of the sun, stored for thousands of years in the bosom of the earth, came back in coal to spread that warmth anew. All Nature died and lived again. Was man destined for a humbler heritage? Was there for him no glorious resurrection? Reason rebelled at the contemplation of such flippant mockery.

Through the ages, learning ever and more forcefully the dependence upon a beneficent Providence, there came to man the startling discovery that, despite his powers, he himself could create nothing. What has man created? Let us suppose, for example, that he created this magnificent and artistic edifice in which we assemble; but he did not. Every item of material for its construction was furnished him in advance. He did no more than change its position and its form. And its art is but an imitation, exemplified and surpassed in countless natural wonders since the world began. The One Supreme is the materialman and the artist in this and every other structure, however poorly we may copy the pattern of the Infinite.

Has man created a mighty power plant at Niagara Falls or at Muscle Shoals? Oh, no. He has but harnessed a part of the power placed there by the Almighty and diverted to his temporal needs its natural force. In the roaring cataract may be found both the motive and the means of the human accomplishment.

But what of the outstanding achievements of physicists and chemists in their laboratories of research? Research—the very word connotes the lack of man's creative genius. At the root of every flower is a chemical laboratory so perfect that man cannot approximate it. In his every effort he relies, perforce, upon things already made and upon natural laws already enacted. There is no field in which some brave Columbus can discover an America which is not already there.

And man has observed another thing—what has been created he cannot destroy. He may resolve matter into its constituent elements, but the elements remain to perform the functions of their creation. Again he can but change the form and position of the things he uses. Against the works of the Almighty the iconoclast labors in vain.

Was man, then, made to be destroyed? Was it for this inglorious end Omnipotence designed the highest order of creation? Is the thought compatible with the purpose of One Supreme in goodness and in wisdom? Reason replied to those queries. It was a matter of common observation that the things of earth do not attain their full usefulness until they have reached a certain maturity. Fruit is eaten when ripe. It is when the sapling becomes a tree that its timbers make a dwelling and a thousand articles of domestic and social progress. And so, the ages have asked, is man to come to the development of his manifold powers, to cultivate the mind and spirit to the greatest possibility of service, only to be cast aside as useless rubbish? Is the image of God the one thing God Himself would destroy?

So it is not strange or surprising that early peoples found in the light of reason a firm basis for their belief that this innate longing for life was predicated upon a logical hope which would ripen into the fulfillment of their most cherished wish. It would have staggered their credulity had one predicted with confidence the telephone, the radio, the airplane, the X-ray, but their abiding faith in this inspiring doctrine of immortality could not be shattered or repressed. Even to their worthy fellow men who had departed to that unknown realm they accorded such enduring earthly remembrance as their restricted powers permitted. Sleeping or waking, they still dreamed of them as living and laboring at their customary tasks. Their tombs were kept with scrupulous care, their memories honored, their wisdom preserved, that such a one as Socrates might live on to teach that everything implies its opposite—that the foul implies the fair, the cold implies the heat, the darkness implies the light, to sleep implies to awaken, to die implies to live again—that in fond recollection they might continue to hear him say, "Wherefore, O Judges, be of good cheer about death, and know this of a truth—that no evil can happen to a good man, either in life or after death."

It is our good fortune to live in a time when reason has been confirmed and reinforced by revelation. In its light the vague and hazy notions of the past become the clear and well-defined knowledge of the present. It has given a new and imperishable foundation for the truth which the groping

reason of man had always sought. It has illumined this earthly existence with a new radiance. It has added inspiration to the effort to build and develop our minds and hearts and characters for life unending. It has manifested a purpose in our making which keeps us pressing onward toward the goal of our perfection. Work has a new meaning, worth a new significance. We are citizens of eternity, unfettered by the limitations of time.

Our departed colleagues have left examples we may emulate. They labored in the light of this enduring assurance. The memory of their worth and work accentuates the promise and the hope which lead us to the heights of our best selves.

When the Pilgrim Fathers embarked to find a home in this new land they took in the bow of their boat the bulbs and seeds and shrubs and plants which after the long voyage would be useful in the home of their quest. In the voyage on life's great sea we, too, like the loved ones who have left us, may take with us those fruits of mind and heart and spirit which will be of service over there.

And so, in the firm conviction of this faith, and in keeping with reason and with revelation, to each of these, our beloved comrades, we may join with family and friends in saying:

Good-bye, good friend;
In God's good time,
In God's good clime,
We'll meet again.
And in that land
Where we shall know
No pain or woe,
We'll understand.

A cornet solo, *Nearer My God to Thee*, was played by Ralph K. Ostrom, master sergeant, United States Army Band Orchestra.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pronounced the benediction:

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess the Speaker called the House to order, and then, pursuant to House Resolution No. 445, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, declared the House adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10 a. m. Thursday, April 21, 1938, in room 346, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 9745, to provide for guaranties of collective bargaining in contracts entered into and in the grant or loans of funds by the United States, or any agency thereof, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The Committee on the Library will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, April 21, 1938, in room 1536, New House Office Building, on the following bills: H. R. 10217, House Joint Resolution 656, House Joint Resolution 631, House Joint Resolution 620, and House Joint Resolution 647.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 445, House Office Building, Thursday, April 21, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of unfinished business, private bills.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Mr. Eicher's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at

10 a. m. Monday, April 25, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 10292, trust indentures.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will begin hearings on the general subject of civil-service retirement on Tuesday, April 26, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., in room 246, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1252. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill entitled "An act for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;" to the Committee on Labor.

1253. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 4, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on reexamination of Herring Bay and Rockhold Creek, Md., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 27, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 595); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1254. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on reexamination of Richmond Harbor, Calif., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, adopted May 10, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 598); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1255. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 4, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of channel from Seaboard Air Line Railway through Bay of Naples and adjacent waters to Gordons Pass and Big Marco Pass, via Dollar Bay and adjacent waters to Big Marco Pass, Little Marco Pass, and entrance into Rookery Bay, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 596); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1256. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 6, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of, and review of reports on, Mississippi River at and near New Orleans, La., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted July 6, 1937, and March 25, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture," approved June 24, 1936; with amendment (Rept. No. 2165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9226. A bill to amend the act of March 9, 1928, authorizing appropriations to be made for the disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10193. A bill to authorize the President, when the public interest render such course advisable, to detail any civilian employee of the United States Government to temporary duty with the government of any American Republic or the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10315. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to further promote the merchant marine policy therein declared, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 10332. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; with amendment (Rept. No. 2164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10333) to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 10334) to extend for 2 additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on land-bank commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 10335) to amend section 301 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 10336) to impose a duty on nepheline syenite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10337) to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: Resolution (H. Res. 467) to create a select committee to investigate the desirability of consolidating agencies of the Government concerned with transportation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 468) for the consideration of H. R. 10315; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10338) for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 10339) for the relief of Isaac Friedlander; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4885. By Mr. BUCK: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6 of the State Legislature of California, relative to Federal tax on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4886. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 of the State Legislature of California, relative to House bill 9256; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4887. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State Legislature of California, relative to provision of all necessary aids to night air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4888. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15 of the State Legislature of California, relative to aliens in America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4889. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 of the State Legislature of California, relative to Federal funds for flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 20, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 20, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Pope
Andrews	Dieterich	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Donahay	La Follette	Reames
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Reynolds
Bailey	Ellender	Lewis	Russell
Bankhead	Frazier	Lodge	Schwollenbach
Barkley	George	Logan	Sheppard
Berry	Gerry	Lonergan	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	Lundeen	Smathers
Bone	Gillette	McCarran	Smith
Borah	Glass	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brown, Mich.	Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Brown, N. H.	Guffey	McNary	Townsend
Bulkeley	Hale	Maloney	Truman
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Tydings
Burke	Hatch	Minton	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hayden	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Herring	Neely	Wagner
Capper	Hill	Norris	Walsh
Caraway	Hitchcock	Nye	Wheeler
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	White
Connally	Hughes	Overton	
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce for the RECORD that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MILTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is unavoidably detained.

I request that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Veterans' Relief Commission of Madison County, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient Public Works projects necessary to give work to